

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XIX

JANUARY, 1926

NUMBER 1

LITERATURE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

IN GERMANY, HOLLAND, AND THE SCANDINAVIAN COUNTRIES,
1921-1924

HANS WINDISCH

PROFESSOR OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IN LEYDEN, HOLLAND

(WITH THE AID OF DR. A. FRIDRICHSSEN, DOCENT IN OSLO, NORWAY¹)

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. General	
1. Method; Criticism of the New Testament	3
2. Introduction	5
3. Textual Criticism	9
4. Canon of the New Testament	17
5. Philology of the New Testament	17
6. Commentaries	21
II. The Synoptic Gospels	
1. The Synoptic Problem	23
2. Literary Criticism	26
3. Commentaries	30
III. Jesus and the Gospels	
1. Surveys	30
2. The Personality and Life of Jesus	33
3. The Radical Christ-Myth	37
4. The Gospel Narratives	
(a) Infancy of Jesus	40
(b) Public Ministry (General)	42
(c) Jesus in Galilee	43
(d) Jesus in Jerusalem	47
5. The Sayings of Jesus	
(a) The Sermon on the Mount	52
(b) Parables	55
(c) Other Sayings	56
6. The Teaching of Jesus	
(a) Ethics of Jesus	58
(b) Jesus' Conception of Himself	61

¹ The notices written by Dr. Fridrichsen are signed (Fr.).

IV. The Johannine Writings	
1. The Author.....	62
2. The Fourth Gospel.....	63
3. The Epistles of John.....	70
4. The Apocalypse.....	70
V. The Acts of the Apostles.....	73
VI. Paul and his Epistles	
1. Life of Paul.....	76
2. Genuineness of the Epistles.....	79
3. Commentaries on the Epistles.....	80
4. Theology and Piety of Paul	
(a) General.....	82
(b) Special Doctrines.....	85
(c) Single Passages in the Epistles.....	90
VII. The Epistle to the Hebrews and the Epistle of James.....	92
VIII. New Testament Apocrypha.....	93
IX. Primitive Christianity	
1. General.....	95
2. Special Studies.....	98
X. Theology of the New Testament	
1. General.....	104
2. Special Studies.....	105
XI. The Investigation of the New Testament by the Aid of the History of Religions.....	108

ABBREVIATIONS

AR	Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
ANG	Aus Natur und Geisteswelt. Leipzig, Teubner.
BFchTh	Beiträge zur Förderung der christlichen Theologie. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann.
BSt	Biblische Studien. Freiburg, Herder.
BiblZ	Biblische Zeitschrift. Freiburg, Herder.
ChW	Christliche Welt.
DLZ	Deutsche Literaturzeitung.
DTT	[Dansk] Teologisk Tidsskrift.
ExpT	Expository Times.
FRLanT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
GGA	Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen.
HThR	Harvard Theological Review.
HZ	Historische Zeitschrift.
JThS	Journal of Theological Studies.
LZBl	Literarisches Zentralblatt.
Mus	Museum, Leyden.
NA	Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen. Münster, Aschendorff.
NKZ	Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.
NtF	Neutestamentliche Forschungen, hrsg. von O. Schmitz.

NThSt	Nieuwe Theologische Studien.
NTT	Nieuw Theologisch Tijdschrift.
NoTT	Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift.
SA	Symbolae Arctoeae. Christiania, Norway.
SAB	Sitzungsberichte, Berlin Academy.
ThBl	Theologische Blätter.
ThGg	Theologie der Gegenwart. Leipzig, Deichert.
ThLB	Theologischer Literaturbericht.
ThLBl	Theologisches Literaturblatt.
ThLZ	Theologische Literaturzeitung. Leipzig, Hinrichs.
ThRev	Theologische Revue. Münster, Aschendorff.
ThStKr	Theologische Studien und Kritiken.
ZKG	Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte.
ZNTW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft.
ZThK	Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche.

I. GENERAL

1. METHOD; CRITICISM OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Deissner, K., Religionsgeschichtliche Parallelen: ihr Wert und ihre Verwendung (Prinzipienfragen der neutestamentlichen Forschung, Heft 1). 34 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1921. — *Bertram, G.*, Die Bedeutung der kultgeschichtlichen Methode für die neutestamentliche Forschung (ThBl, Feb. 1923). — *Lietzmann, H.*, Schallanalyse und Textkritik (reprint from GGA, 1919, nos. 5/6, 11/12). 33 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1922. — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Vom Auslegen, insonderheit des Neuen Testaments. 34 pp. Halle, Niemeyer, 1922.

A METHODOLOGICAL discussion of the value and use of parallels from the history of religion retains its value, especially to-day, when the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode' is rejected even by some scholars of genuine insight. *Deissner*, a conservative theologian, recognizes in principle the justification of the method, and aims to set the New Testament in its relation to the history of civilization and of religion. He holds the comparison of Christian traditions with kindred non-christian facts to be indispensable, but criticizes the usual method, as employed for instance by Bousset, on the ground that it pays too much attention to the connection of the New Testament with the world of religion outside and too little to the specific nature of Christianity itself. To him, comparison with other religions is a means for determining the connection and contact of the New Testament with the world at large (for example, in the

field of language) with the object of showing how incomparable is the New Testament, how underived, real, original — dogmatically speaking, of showing its supernatural character, built up of elements which the conception of a purely immanent cause leaves unexplained. His book is intended to be conciliatory, and formulates in detail various sound principles, such as the distinction between adopting alien religious terminology and filling it with new and distinctive contents. He errs in making the problem too simple and trying to solve it by a dogma. The relations of primitive Christianity to the development of religion in general are too complicated to be covered by the mere distinction between form and contents. It is also a mistake to identify the individual and distinctive with the essential. To the essential elements of primitive Christian tradition belong in fact those which find complete analogy in syncretism and Judaism, and it is dangerous to rest the character of Christianity as revelation on those elements only which a scholar thinks not to be derivative or to have no analogies. Others may think differently, or the missing analogies may be found to-morrow! (See also Bultmann, *ThLZ*, 1922, no. 10.)

One form of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode' is the 'kultgeschichtliche.' *G. Bertram*, known through his book, "Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult,"² has developed from the principles there followed a specific method explained in detail in the article here mentioned. His starting-point is the refusal (like Wrede, "Ueber Aufgabe und Methode der sogenannten neutestamentlichen Theologie," 1897) to treat the New Testament documents as containing a body of doctrines or as reflecting the religion of individuals. He assumes rather that Christianity is in essence one of the ancient religions of a group centering in a form of worship. This supplements the 'formgeschichtliche Methode,' emphasizing the inner relation of the material of the tradition to its form. The gospels are to be taken as cult-narratives. They give the ritual by which the believer is to order his life. To the cult-motive all others — apologetic, dogmatic, missionary — are purely secondary. The gospels contain the popular tradition of a cult-group,

² See below, p. 28.

which has here created the legend and myth of its cult-hero. Only so is to be explained the teaching of Jesus, with its indifference to the general interests of civilization, and New Testament Christianity in its character as a religion of redemption with ritual and sacrament, after the ancient conception. This 'method' is significant for the present day in emphasizing the cleft between religion and civilization, between God and the world, and in taking the absolute and unconditioned in religion as fundamental.

Since my report on the 'schallanalytische Methode' (in *REVIEW*, 1922, pp. 177-179), *H. Lietzmann's* criticism of that method has appeared. He created a Greek text, and then — having asked E. Sievers and W. Schanze, the "sound-analyzers," to analyze it — printed in parallel columns their analysis and the real facts of the case. The 'Schallanalyse' proved a complete failure.

E. von Dobschütz's rectoral address, while emphasizing that modern critical exegesis, with its attempt to understand the text from a psychological reconstruction of the mind and personality of the author, does not have the last word, and admitting the rightful claims of 'edifying' exegesis, warns against the tendency to a purely intuitive, emotional apprehension of biblical values and words after the fashion exemplified by Barth.³ In fourteen pages of notes he gives instructive discussions and references to books and articles.

2. INTRODUCTION

Knopf, R., Einführung in das Neue Testament (Sammlung Töpelmann, Die Theologie in Abriss 2). 2nd edition, revised by H. Weinel and H. Lietzmann. 406 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1923. — *Feine, P.*, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3rd revised edition. 267 pp. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer, 1923. — *Appel, H.*, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 258 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1922. — *Schäfer, H.*, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3rd edition, revised by M. Meinertz. xvi, 452 pp. Paderborn, 1921. — *Barth, F.*, Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 4th and 5th editions. viii, 494 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1921. — *Brun, L.*, Det nye testamente i lys av historisk forskning. 115 pp. Christiania, Norli, 1922. — *Torm, F.*, Indledning til det nye Testamente. 460 pp. Copenhagen, Gad, 1923. — *Stählin, O.*, Die alt-christliche griechische Literatur (W. v.

³ See below, pp. 80f.

Christ, Geschichte der griechischen Literatur II, 2, 6th edition, pp. 1105-1500). Munich, Beck, 1924.

A new edition of the excellent Introduction of *Knopf* († 1920) is issued by Weinelt and Lietzmann. The old text is retained in the main, but references to literature and to new problems are added. Weinelt, the real editor, has been able to print the text substantially unchanged because of his agreement with the critical position of Knopf, especially in regard to the Synoptic tradition. As the only critical survey of the entire field of the New Testament, the book has deservedly gained an important place in university study.⁴

Feine has also brought his Introduction up to date, with some enlargement. A résumé of recent studies of the Synoptic gospels by the 'formgeschichtliche Methode' is added and the account of the two-source theory is somewhat altered and extended. Mark is no longer thought to be dependent on Q, and account is taken of a gradual growth of the Gospel. A notice and detailed criticism of Cadbury's studies on the writings of Luke is added. In the rewritten section on chronology, Feine rightly adopts Zahn's assignment of Paul's imprisonment to the year 58. He discusses in detail Hadorn's dating of Thessalonians, and Lütgert's hypothesis that in Galatians Paul's controversy is directed both against Galatian pneumatism and against Judaism, as well as Schanze's "Schallanalyse." The author has not had access to all of the recent English, American, and French publications. The history of the canon and of the text is considerably expanded, with a concluding paragraph on the present state of New Testament textual criticism.⁵

Appel's book is entirely new, and original as well. Intended as an introductory textbook for students, it is distinguished by great thoroughness and care. In the brief accounts of the work of earlier scholars on the successive topics the author confines himself too much to the work of Germans. At the opening of each section are given the passages from the Apostolic Fathers and the later church fathers which apply;

⁴ See also Bultmann, ThLZ, 1923, no. 19.

⁵ See Brückner, ThBl, 1923, no. 7.

here the author, a Mecklenburg pastor, has freshly examined the entire material, and often suggests solutions of his own for the problems which arise. In spite of his conservatism, he occasionally departs from tradition. Thus the singular relation between 1 and 2 Thessalonians is explained by the supposition that the first epistle was written before, but sent after, the second. The Epistle to the Romans had throughout an actual occasion: namely, after the revocation of the edict of Claudius against the Jews, the Jews came back to Rome, and a rivalry sprang up between Jewish and gentile Christians; hence the main purpose of Romans is to maintain the gentile-christian character of the church and fully to incorporate the Jewish Christians into it. Romans 16 was written later than 1-15, when Paul had found a messenger for the letter in Phoebe. For Philippians, Colossians, Ephesians, and Philemon, the author endeavors, in part with new arguments, to prove an Ephesian origin. The Pastoral Epistles date from about the year 100 (although Appel assumes that the Spanish journey and the second imprisonment in Rome are authentic), but they contain genuine Pauline passages, viz.: 2 Tim. 1, 15-18; 4, 9-21; 2, 18; 1 Tim. 1, 20; Titus 3, 12-15 (all from the time of the imprisonment in Caesarea), as well as the instructions now found in a revised form in 1 Timothy. Hebrews was written by Apollos and addressed to Jewish Christians in Corinth, a theory which Appel supports from the literary resemblances shown by Hebrews to 1 Corinthians and 1 Clement; ⁶ time of composition, between 64 and 70. James and Jude were written by simple Christians bearing these names, James between 75 and 85, Jude toward the end of the first century. 2 Peter copied Jude; date, the beginning of the second century. The two-source theory of the Synoptic Gospels is lucidly stated. Mark is dependent on Q, is based on the narratives of Peter, and was composed at the beginning of the Jewish war. Matthew was written for Jewish Christians of the Diaspora soon after 70. The apostle Matthew was the author of Q. Luke the physician is the author of the Gospel of Luke and of Acts; the former

⁶ See also H. Appel, *Der Hebräerbrief ein Schreiben des Apollos an Judenchristen der Korinthischen Gemeinde*, 1918.

composed after 70, the latter about 80. John the son of Zebedee is the author of all the Johannine writings. In Revelation Appel distinguishes between earlier component parts (10 ff., 17 ff., composed in 68–69) and later ones (the three heptads and the seven messages, about 80). In the Gospel of John, he thinks the speeches were first written, then the narratives; and rejects all other hypotheses of sources and interpolations. Decisive for genuineness is the consideration that a new gospel, so radically different from the Synoptic type, could not have been accepted unless the readers knew the author to be an eye-witness. That in the speeches John went beyond the teaching of Jesus, adding to it and deepening it in the spirit of the apostolic 'pneumatic' interpretation, is to be justified from 14, 25 f., and 16, 12 f.

The Introduction by *Schäfer-Meinertz* is the best Roman Catholic work on the subject in German. The new edition is distinguished by full use of the literature and by a critical judgment, so far as the Biblical Commission permits.⁷ The new edition of *Barth's* Introduction is a reprint of the third, with the addition of four pages of bibliography.

Brun's little book is a popular introduction to the books of the New Testament with a brief outline of the history of the canon. The point of view is that of moderate criticism; the Gospel of John presupposes Paulinism; the Pastoral Epistles and perhaps Ephesians are deuteropauline. — *Torm's* Introduction is confined to the problems of introduction in the narrowest sense, and everywhere upholds the tradition of the early church. (Fr.)

Finally, an Introduction to the New Testament is included in *Stählin's* work on Early Christian Greek Literature, pages 1122–1183, with bibliographies; on pages 1184–1245 the primitive non-canonical literature is treated.⁸

⁷ See K. L. Schmidt, ThBl, 1922, no. 5; Jülicher, ThLZ, 1922, no. 21; Sickenberger, BiblZ, xiv, 218.

⁸ See Strathmann, ThGg, 1924, 172 f.

3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Nestle, E., Novum Testamentum graece cum apparatu critico. Editio duodecima recognita. xxiv, 665 pp. Stuttgart, 1923; Novum Testamentum graece et latine. Editio sexta. xxxiii + bis 658 pp. Stuttgart, 1921. — *Vogels, H. J.*, Novum Testamentum graece. 2nd revised edition. 661 pp. Düsseldorf, Schwann, 1922; Novum Testamentum graece et latine. Two vols. I: Evangelia et Acta Apostolorum. II: Epistolae et Apocalypsis. 661 pp. *Ibid.* 1922. — *Huck, A.*, Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien. 6th edition revised and improved. Appendix: Die Johannesparallelen. xlii, 247 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1922. — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Eberhard Nestle's Einführung in das Neue Testament. 4th fully revised edition. 160 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1923. — *Vogels, H. J.*, Handbuch der neutestamentlichen Textkritik. 255 pp. Münster, Aschendorff, 1923. — *Schmiedel, P. W.*, Der Ertrag der Arbeit Hermann von Soden's am Text des Neuen Testaments (ThBl, Oct., 1922). — *Pott, A.*, Hermann von Soden's neutestamentlicher Text (ThBl, March, 1923); Marcion's Evangelientext (ZKG, n. s. V, 1923, 202–223). — *Plooij, D.*, A Primitive Text of the Diatessaron. The Liège Manuscript of a Mediaeval Dutch Translation. A preliminary study, with an introductory note by Dr. J. Rendel Harris. 85 pp. Leyden, A. W. Sijthoff, 1923. — *Jülicher, A.*, Ein neu entdecktes Leben Jesu (ChW, 1924, no. 11–13); Der echte Tatiantext (Journal of Biblical Literature, XLIII, 1924, 132–171). — *Plooij, D.*, Eine enkratitische Glosse im Diatessaron (ZNTW, 1923, 1–15). — *Bauernfeind, O.*, Der Römerbrieftext des Origenes nach dem Codex von der Goltz (Texte und Untersuchungen 44, 3). 119 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1923. — *Diehl, E.*, Zur Textgeschichte des lateinischen Paulus. I (ZNTW, 1921, 97–133). — *Kraft, B.*, Zwei unbekannte lateinische Evangelienhandschriften (BiblZ, xvi, 214 f.). — *Vogels, H. J.*, Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der lateinischen Apokalypseübersetzung. v, 247 pp. Düsseldorf, Schwann, 1920; Der Apostelkatalog bei Markus in der altlateinischen Uebersetzung (BiblZ, xvi, 1924, 66–76). — *Fischer, —*, Die Donnersöhne Mk. 3, 7 (ZNTW, 1924, 310 f.). — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Zur Liste der neutestamentlichen Handschriften (ZNTW, 1924, 248–264). — *Rudberg, G.*, Främmande egennamn i grekiskan. (Festskrift for Stave, 184–193). Upsala, 1922.

The latest edition of *Eberhard Nestle's* "Novum Testamentum graece" has been altered only by additions and corrections in the citing of parallel passages. A memorial notice of the author is contributed by his son, Ervin Nestle. A more considerable revision which is in preparation will deal only with the apparatus, not with the text. — In the Graeco-Latin New Testament of Nestle, the Greek text is identical with that of the 11th Greek edition, revised only as regards the citation of parallels.

The second edition of *Vogels'* Greek New Testament is distinguished from the first only by minor corrections in the apparatus. In Lietzmann's thorough review (ThLZ, 1923, no. 3) criticism is made of the lack of a sound principle in constructing the apparatus of variants, important readings not being noted while others of less importance are included; Vogels depends too much on Tischendorf, and does not always select the witnesses that are characteristic for the origin of a variant. By numerous examples from Romans Lietzmann illustrates a better method; his remarks are important also for commentaries. — The Latin text of the bilingual edition of Vogels is the official text of the Vulgate without critical apparatus, a procedure the cause of which (delay in the granting of ecclesiastical sanction) he explains in the preface of his "Handbuch."⁹

Huck's Synopsis has commended itself both to teachers and to students. In the 6th edition improvements are made both in the prolegomena and in the critical apparatus.

Two new Introductions to New Testament textual criticism were published in 1923. The revision of Nestle's "Einführung" by *E. von Dobschütz* is in reality a new work, but very properly, as a matter of sentiment, the name of the scholar to whom textual criticism owes so much was retained in the title.¹⁰ A few remarks may here be in place. Von Dobschütz's account of the history of the text in Part I is interesting, but requires a knowledge of the materials and methods described in Part II, and a beginner might well read Part II first. Even special scholars can learn much from the book. The lists are accurate and instructive; the development of the method (first external criticism, then internal) is original and pedagogically felicitous; the plates are well chosen. Of Nestle's own last revision of his book (the third edition, 1909), the first half, which von Dobschütz has drastically condensed, still preserves its value, and the second half (theory and practice of textual criticism) also remains worth reading, at least for specialists. It is to be hoped that the unavoidable but regrettable failure to mention much

⁹ See below. See also BiblZ, xvi, p. 225.

¹⁰ See the review and appreciation in the Harvard Theological Review, January, 1924, pp. 91-94.

of the recent literature from outside of Germany may be made good in another edition.¹¹

The Handbook by *Vogels* appeared at the same time as von Dobschütz's book and well supplements it. Indeed, the work of this Roman Catholic scholar may perhaps be preferred by many to that of the Protestant. It is not so condensed, nor so erudite, but it mentions many characteristic details, not to be found in von Dobschütz, regarding the manuscripts. *Vogels*, who has worked in the field of Latin translations and has lately attacked the problem of the Diatessaron (see below), is especially full in his treatment of matters connected with these subjects. He deals with Marcion and Tatian in a special section, and rightly emphasizes Marcion's influence on the official text of the church, though paying too little attention to the probability that his text was mainly a 'Western' one which he found current in Rome about the year 150 (Zahn). *Vogels* accepts von Soden's theory that Tatian's Diatessaron is the main cause of the confusion of the textual tradition, although he rightly has very grave doubts about the method by which von Soden supports it. That this thesis explains *all* the peculiar readings of the 'Western' text and *all* the harmonizing variants in the gospels, even *Vogels* has not made probable. The testimony of Jerome (Ep. ad Damasum) that in the course of centuries the confusion had increased, cannot, I think, be lightly set aside. In the presentation of text-critical method also *Vogels* affords a welcome supplement to von Dobschütz, although the latter is superior in his handling of principles. He discusses the sources of error in detail, with numerous and telling examples, both of unintentional mistakes (homoiooteleuton, dittography) and of intentional alterations (harmonization within and without the gospels; assimilation to the Septuagint; dogmatic correction). Prominent among the dogmatic corrections are those tending toward asceticism, to be traced to Tatian. The inner connections of groups of readings, already remarked by von Dobschütz (pp. 127 ff.), are studied closely by *Vogels*, who gives many instructive and usually convincing examples, and here again finds Tatian the chief cause of a far-reaching revision

¹¹ See also J. de Zwaan, NThSt, 1924, p. 25.

(§ 22). In conclusion he suggests "new paths" for textual criticism, consisting chiefly in the study of the history of the Syriac and Latin versions and their connection with Greek authorities. The development in Syria was in reality a process of "detatianizing"; likewise for the Latin gospels, a diatessaronic text was the main force at work.¹²

Schmiedel's article on the results of von Soden's work on the text of the New Testament is instructive, although unfortunately the criticism is almost annihilating. He finds the arrangement of the triple apparatus insufficient, the variants being confined to single words instead of comprising connected phrases; the selection of variants and assignment to the three categories is often arbitrary and the statements unreliable. *Schmiedel* refers, among others, to the criticism by *Hoskier*.¹³

As a supplement to this critique, *A. Pott's* article is indispensable, since the author was for years a colleague of von Soden and yet maintains an impartial attitude toward his method and achievements. In particular he gives von Soden the credit of abandoning the superstition that the oldest manuscripts which happen to have survived necessarily give the best text. If, nevertheless, von Soden's primitive text I-H-K is substantially H, and therefore equivalent to B α , that is due to his Tatian-hypothesis (rejected by Pott), by which he was led to ascribe almost all variants in I and K (as against H) to the Tatianic revision. But Pott points out that von Soden's Tatian is a wholly uncertain quantity, since he relied too much on the Arabic Tatian. Furthermore, the so-called Tatianic text, as Pott showed in *Mnemosyne* 1920,¹⁴ is substantially a pre-canonical text, which both Tatian and Marcion found ready at hand, and which also is extant in D, African Latin, European Latin, and Syriac. Pott admits many defects in von Soden's edition of the text, but endeavors to account for them. To the hand-edition of the text he ascribes a distinct value. — *Pott* has continued his studies of Marcion's text of the gospels, chiefly in a discussion of the views of Har-

¹² See Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1924, no. 12.

¹³ See *JThS*, 1913-14, 307-326.

¹⁴ Cf. *HThR* 1922, 120 f.

nack and von Soden. By a detailed comparison of texts he shows that Marcion's text was in the main pre-canonical, and like Tatian's, with which it often coincides, one of the oldest representatives of the pre-canonical text, which comes very near to the original text. Pott also examines Harnack's list of readings in Marcion that show partisan tendency, and reduces its length, although admitting a certain number of such readings.

The Tatian problem occupies indeed at present the centre of the stage. *Plooij* has the great merit of showing the importance of an early Dutch harmony of the gospels, long ago made available but only now by him introduced into the discussion. He has at least proved that the Dutch harmony depends upon the Old Latin Diatessaron and that it preserves important diatessaronic readings. His further conclusions are: (1) The Old Latin gospels have been influenced largely by the Latin Diatessaron, and this influence was probably exercised at the very beginning; that is, the Latin Diatessaron is the oldest translation of the gospels into Latin; (2) The Old Latin Diatessaron is probably a translation from the Syriac, not from the Greek — there never was a Greek Diatessaron! A. Pott, in a noteworthy review,¹⁵ admits that the Old Latin gospels are influenced by the Latin Diatessaron, but that the Diatessaron is earlier than the Old Latin separate gospels and influenced them from the beginning, seems to him as yet unproved. Pott also recognizes that the primitive Latin text of the Dutch harmony was influenced by a Syriac Diatessaron, but does not agree with Plooij in thinking it a translation from the latter. Especially he objects to giving up the idea of a Greek primitive Tatian, the existence of which is proved by the occurrence of diatessaronic variants in Greek manuscripts.

Another drastic criticism of Plooij is from the hand of *Jülicher*, who is likewise skeptical toward the particular theses with which Plooij has burdened his study. Jülicher continues to maintain that the original text of the Diatessaron was Greek, and explains the Latin primitive Diatessaron as a translation from this Greek, in which the translator was influenced

¹⁵ Phil. Wochenschr., 1923, no. 39.

by the text of the Old Latin gospels. Thus both the Syriac and Latin Diatessarons were translations from the Greek, and in this way is to be explained their agreement in variants, since Jülicher does not admit that there are any proper Syriasms in the Western Diatessaron texts. Against the exclusion of the Greek Diatessaron from the field he brings forward the weighty argument that Tatian can hardly have accomplished at one and the same time the laborious translation into Syriac and the creation of so finely finished a work of art as the Diatessaron. He further insists that the Dutch manuscript ought not to be studied in isolation, but in connection with the Middle High German texts of the harmony, since the two have a common source. Moreover he warns against referring all the expansions of the text found in these harmonies to Tatian's Diatessaron, instead of recognizing in them glosses which only later crept into the text, especially as incident to the translation.¹⁶ These and other objections of Jülicher's call for serious consideration. — *Lietzmann* (ZNTW, 1923, 150-153), on the other hand, ascribes much weight to the Syriasms pointed out by Plooiĵ in the Dutch harmony. He observes that the Dutch text differs from that of Aphraates in important passages, and in such a way as to make Aphraates' connection with the Diatessaron doubtful. — *M. Dibelius* (ThLZ, 1924, no. 9) is more skeptical, and thinks the few examples that Plooiĵ has tentatively adduced insufficient to prove his bold theses; he urges as a primary requirement the reconstruction in Latin of Tatian, without which it is not possible to determine his relation to the Old Latin gospels or to the Syriac Diatessaron. Of the same mind are J. de Zwaan (NThSt, 1924, 20 f.) and Hans von Soden (ZKG, 1924, 264 f.). See also H. J. Vogels (ThRev, xxii, 81-84).

An encratite purpose would make highly probable the Tatianic origin of striking variants in the Dutch harmony. *Plooiĵ* (ZNTW) sees an encratite gloss in the form of the discussion on divorce, where the Dutch text says that God "united" man and wife and prefixes to the quotation of Gen. 2, 24 the words, "and Adam said." The former rendering Plooiĵ

¹⁶ So also de Zwaan, NThSt, 1924, 20 f.

refers to 'spiritual marriage,' while the words about carnal union are expressly withdrawn from God and put into a human mouth. He illustrates his interpretation from Hermas and Aphraates. The theory of an encratite character is not wholly convincing either in this passage or in the rendering of Luke 20, 34-36 in the Dutch harmony, which can, indeed, be understood as implying that encratism was already the practice in this life and was the necessary condition of sharing in the world to come, but where the original eschatological reference can also be retained.

Another study of importance for textual history is that of *Bauernfeind*, on the Athos codex of the Epistle to the Romans (Cod. 184, B 64 of the Lawra monastery), discovered by E. von der Goltz. A comparison of this codex with the quotations from Romans in the fragment of Origen's commentary on the epistle shows that the text of the codex is really derived from his text. Some variations may be intentional on the part of the learned scribe of the codex himself or of his predecessors, or may have been drawn from Origen's exposition (the *ῥητόν*). More important are the variations in the other works of Origen (chiefly earlier than his commentary on Romans). In the main the examination has to be confined to the works preserved in Greek. The Athos codex shows far fewer 'Western' peculiarities than do the quotations. *Bauernfeind* explains this by supposing that in his commentary on Romans Origen used a text (that, namely, found in the Athos codex) differing somewhat from his usual text, and that this divergent text rested on a recension of his own, chiefly intended to eliminate the 'Western' readings. In an appendix the Athos codex is printed with apparatus.¹⁷

Diehl leads us far into the textual history of the Latin Paul, treating first the direct tradition. After a survey of the authorities for the text (codices, commentaries, excerpts) he studies the relation of the authorities to d (Codex Claromontanus), and reaches the result that all of them, including the Vulgate, are dependent on d, but that d has suffered a redaction

¹⁷ See also P. Koetschau, ThLZ, 1923, no. 25/26, with important supplementary material.

or revision (erasure of errors, removal of certain grecisms, etc.), producing d_1 , which is not much later than d (d being from the second half of the second century). No special Greek text was used for this redaction, for all Latin authorities have but one exemplar, which was the archetype of D and d . From d_1 , even before Jerome, was developed the Vulgate type, the first representatives of which are Novatian and the translator of Irenaeus, whom Diehl places before 250. The type d goes back to Irenaeus's copy of the Apostolos; the Vulgate type, to Novatian. This interesting theory deserves serious examination.

Kraft gives a short description of two Augsburg Latin manuscripts of the gospels, from the 11th and 9th centuries, the value of which lies in the accompanying summaries.

Vogels has investigated the history of the Latin versions of Revelation. It was translated at least three times (texts of Primasius, Tyconius, and Gigas), all in the 2nd century, yet no one of these translations is preserved except in mixed forms. The second part of the book gives the text of Revelation from Primasius, Tyconius, and Gigas, the palimpsest of Fleury, and other citations. See also Hans von Soden, *ThLZ*, 1921, no. 11-12.

Vogels (in *BZ*) brings together very lucidly the Old Latin translations of Mark 3, 3-16 in the several manuscripts and proves that the oldest Latin text read: *et inposuit nomen simoni petrum; communiter vocavit eos (illos) boanerges*, etc. Thus Boanerges was a surname for all the apostles; so also in *W* (the Freer ms.).—*Fischer* points out further evidence for the application of the name 'Sons of Thunder' (Boanerges) to all the apostles: Migne, *Scriptores Graeci*, vol. XXX, col. 813B (Basilus, *De syneisact.*).

Von Dobschütz, who is carrying on Gregory's work in textual criticism, gives in this article a continuation of Gregory's list of New Testament manuscripts, with the use of the latter's manuscript material. His supplement includes papyri (P 15-20, 31-36), majuscules (0171-0188), minuscules (2293-2354), and lectionaries and manuscripts of the Latin and Armenian versions; and in each class he is able to make some corrections relating to manuscripts previously described. For the further

prosecution of this work he asks the coöperation of all fellow-students.

Rudberg's work on the writing of foreign proper names in Greek includes the Septuagint and the New Testament. The various motives that caused such proper names to be hellenized or not were lack of training in language or lack of interest in language and style, the familiarity and frequency of occurrence of the name in question, and the scribe's own learning and feeling for style. Numerous examples are given, with material important for New Testament criticism. (Fr.)

4. CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Bestmann, J., Zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons. 136 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1922.

The burden of *Bestmann's* book is that the New Testament owes its origin to the conflict with Judaism and Jewish Christians. The book of Enoch, which appeared 17 or 18 years after the death of Jesus, was a pioneer and a pattern in influencing the writings of the New Testament. Matthew, James, and Mark were directed against Enoch. The Odes of Solomon served as model for the Gospel of John, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs for 1 John. Some suggestive ideas appear to be buried here under much that is fantastic. The oldest canon is that of Marcion.¹⁸

5. PHILOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Cremer, H., Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch der neutestamentlichen Gräzität, bearbeitet von J. Kögel. 11th edition (= 10th, 1915). 1233 pp. Gotha, Perthes, 1923. — *Ebeling, Heinr.*, Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament. 2nd unrevised edition (1st, 1913). 428 pp. Hanover, Hahn, 1923. — *Schmoller, O.*, Handkonkordanz zum griechischen Neuen Testament. 5th edition, newly revised and with new material added by A. Schmoller. 510 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1923. — *Debrunner, A.*, Friedrich Blass' Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch. 5th edition. xviii, 336 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921. — *Michaelis, W.*, Der Attizismus und das Neue Testament (ZNTW, 1923, 91-121). — *Schütz, R.*, Die Bedeutung der Kolometrie für das Neue Testament (ZNTW, 1922, 161-186). — *Woerner, R.*, Die frohe Botschaft. Nach Matthäus. Nach Markus. Nach Lukas. Nach Johannes. Munich,

¹⁸ Compare Brückner, ThBl, 1923, no. 8.

Beck, 1922. — *Deissmann, A.*, Licht vom Osten. 4th fully revised edition. xviii, 447 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1923. — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Aus der Umwelt des Neuen Testaments (ThStKr, 1924, 314-332). — *Gyllenberg, R.*, Pistis. 2 vols. 89, 112 pp. Helsingfors, 1922. — *Lindblom, J.*, Skandalon. Eine lexikalisch-exegetische Untersuchung. Upsala, Universitetsårsskrift, 1921.

Debrunner has made little change in his excellent revision of Blass's Grammar (4th edition, 1913). Some new literature is cited and there are small corrections and additions in the text.

W. Michaelis, a pupil of Deissmann, lays down the rule that atticistic influence on the style and form of the New Testament can only be affirmed in points which conform to the express requirements of ancient atticistic theory and the observed usage of known atticizing writers. The value of his investigation, which has been completed for the Synoptic Gospels but under present conditions cannot be published, can be judged only when the details have been made public. He is convinced that single manuscripts and groups in the Synoptic Gospels show sporadic atticizing, due to learned revision.

At the suggestion of E. Norden, *R. Schütz* has made a fresh study of colometry (the division of the words of the text into sense-groups) and its significance for the New Testament (see HThR, 1922, 124). Colometry is indispensable for reading aloud intelligently and bringing out the rhythm. In the New Testament it serves to make clear the poetic quality of the religious language of primitive Christianity. Schütz points out, with illustrations, that the language of religion in ancient times was not prose but poetry. In a reprint from ThBl, 1922, no. 2, he gives a free translation into German of the Epistle of James, in an Iambic rhythm and printed colometrically.¹⁹ Colometric studies may be of service to exegesis.

R. Woerner has made a similar attempt with the four gospels. The translation seeks to keep the Greek order of words, and so produces an artificial style, with rather unhappy effect. On the whole, however, the peculiar rhythm of the gospels is strikingly reproduced. In the different parts of the New Testa-

¹⁹ Der Jakobusbrief nach Sinnzeilen ins Deutsche übertragen. 12 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922.

ment the rhythm varies, being much more marked in the long discourses, such as Matt. 11, 25 ff.; 6, 19 ff., than in the plain narrative.²⁰

The fourth edition of *Deissmann's* "Licht vom Osten" is announced as fully rewritten (*neubearbeitet*), but in fact the revision is limited to (1) the very welcome addition of five letters to the specimens of non-literary writing, (2) certain additions in the text, (3) the completion of the bibliography by many additions, and (4) five new appendices. Otherwise the text remains unchanged, and hence the new edition is not adjusted to the altered situation for which Deissmann himself deserves a large share of the credit. Thus his polemic sometimes relates to questions that are no longer open, and he does not treat the objections raised to his method and conclusions, as for instance, with regard to the exaggerated importance for the New Testament which he assigns to the non-literary texts, his theory of the non-literary character of the Pauline epistles, etc. The new documents, which he carefully interprets, are: No. 2, a letter of Zoilus, servant of Serapis, to the Egyptian financier Apollonius in Alexandria, understood by Deissmann as a piece of actual propaganda for an ancient cult;²¹ Nos. 3 and 4, two letters from Palestine (Tobias to Apollonius and Ptolemy II); Nos. 15 and 16, letters of the Egyptian Sempronius to his mother Saturnila and his brother Maximus, both of which afford a glimpse of complicated family relationships. Among the more important additions to the text are the discussion of Matt. 26, 50, ἐφ' ὃ παύει, for which an analogy has recently been found in an inscription on a drinking vessel, confirming the interrogative interpretation of the phrase (pp. 100 ff., cf. ExpT, xxxiii, 491-493; J. R. Harris, *ibid.*, Aug. 1924). The new appendices discuss: The names Lucius-Lucas (pp. 372-377, reprinted from "Festgabe für A. von Harnack," 1921, pp. 117-120), to the effect that Lucas is a shortening of Lucius; the synagogue inscription of Theodotus at Jerusalem, discovered by Weil (pp. 378-380; cf. Lietzmann, ZNTW, 1921, 171 ff.;

²⁰ See Strathmann, ThGg, 1923, 241 f.

²¹ Compare Deissmann, *The Religion of Jesus and the Faith of Paul*, 1923, pp. 258 ff.

Dalman, *Zeitschr. des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, 1922, 29 f.); the diptych of the Jerusalem veteran M. Valerius Quadratus (pp. 381-386); the epitaph of the Roman Jewess Regina (pp. 387-390), after Nikolaus Müller, "Die Inschriften der jüdischen Katakomben am Monte Verde," no. 145; and finally Kautsky's "Ursprung des Christentums" (pp. 403-405) from "Die Hilfe," 1909, p. 123, a valuable discussion of the views of that socialistic scholar.²²

Von Dobschütz has expanded his discussion of Deissmann's book into a comprehensive critical account of present-day New Testament study, especially as presented by Deissmann's work and that of his pupils. In lexical work he urges that in all citations attention be paid to the range of use and precise sense of each word in the outside documents; the mere statement that it occurs in non-Christian texts is not sufficient. Von Dobschütz justly defends the expression 'Jewish Greek,' and insists on a distinction between 'translation Greek' (the halting Greek of an Aramaic-speaking Jew) and 'biblical Greek' (the conscious imitation of the Septuagint). In exegesis he would lay less stress than Deissmann on the impression which the texts made on readers, that is, on the manner in which they understood them. The main question is as to what the writer of the letter meant to say. On the title *κύριος* as used in the worship of the emperors, von Dobschütz remarks that this title was not peculiar to this worship, and points out the distinctions between the legal, the courtly, the merely polite, and the religious use of the term, all of which must be recognized. He protests against the 'proletarianizing' of the New Testament writings; they arose rather in the lower middle class than among the proletariat. As to theology, he again decries the exaggeration of the mystical element and the over-emphasis on sentiment and emotion in Paul, at the expense of the ethical element. He also warns against confusing mysticism and the Mysteries, and declares that with Paul gnosis means not union with God, but the understanding of the plan

²² See also M. Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1924, no. 2; Lohmeyer, *DLZ*, 1924, no. 10; Bultmann, *ChW*, 1924, no. 24/26, who in turn goes too far in his rejection of Deissmann's method.

of salvation and of God's will. With reference to the history of religions, he objects to the expression 'Christus-kult,' since of a 'cultus' properly so-called there can be no question in the New Testament; a better term would be 'piety in Christ' (*Christusfrömmigkeit*).

Gyllenberg has written a valuable and readable, though very condensed, study on the use and meaning of *πίστις* and allied words in the religions of hellenistic times, and has carried it through with strict method and mature judgment. — *Lindblom* discusses in detail *σκανδαλον* and *σκανδαλίζειν* both within and outside of the New Testament. The idea appears in several shades of meaning, and in various New Testament passages the author corrects previous interpretations or furnishes more secure philological grounds for the current ones. (Fr.)

6. COMMENTARIES

Meyer's *Kommentar über das Neue Testament* (Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht): *Dibelius, M.*, Der Brief des Jakobus, 1921. — *Windisch, H.*, Der zweite Korintherbrief, 1924.

Lietzmann's *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament* (Tübingen, Mohr): *Lietzmann, H.*, An die Korinther. I. II.; An die Galater. 2nd revised edition. 160, 42 pp. 1923. — *Dibelius, M.*, Der Hirt des Hermas. 230 pp. 1923.

Zahn's *Commentar zum Neuen Testament* (Leipzig, Deichert): *Zahn, Th.*, Die Offenbarung Johannis, 346 pp. 1924; Das Evangelium Matthäi, 4th edition. viii, 730 pp. 1922; Das Evangelium Johannis. 5th and 6th editions. vi, 733 pp. 1921; Die Apostelgeschichte, erste Hälfte. 3rd edition. iv, 394 pp. 1922; Die Epistel an die Römer. 3rd edition, revised by F. Hauck. 622 pp. 1924; Die Epistel an die Galater. 3rd edition, revised by F. Hauck. 301 pp. 1922. — *Bachmann, P.*, Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 3rd edition. 493 pp. 1921; Der zweite Brief an die Korinther. 4th edition. 435 pp. 1922. — *Ewald, P.*, Der Brief an die Philipper. 4th edition, revised by A. v. Wohlenberg. 237 pp. 1923. — *Wohlenberg, G.*, Der erste und zweite Brief an Timotheum, Der Brief an Titum. 4th revised edition. 375 pp. 1923; Der erste und zweite Petrusbrief, Der Judasbrief. 3rd edition. 390 pp. 1923. — *Riggenbach, E.*, Der Brief an die Hebräer. 2nd and 3rd editions. liv, 464 pp. 1922.

Tekst en Uitleg (Groningen, Wolters): *Van Nes, H. M.*, De brief aan de Hebrëen, de brief van Jakobus, de eerste brief van Petrus. 140 pp. 1923.

Korte Verklaring der heilige Schrift (Kampen, Kok): *Grosheide, F. W.*, De brief aan de Hebrëen. 194 pp. 1922. — *Grijdanus, S.*, De brief van den apostel Paulus aan de Galaten. 1922. — *Van Leeuwen, J. A. C.*, De brief aan de Colossensen en die aan de Thessalonicensen. 77, 119 pp. 1923.

Strack, H. L., and Billerbeck, P., Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch (Munich, C. H. Beck): Vol. I. Das Evangelium nach Matthäus. 1055 pp. 1922. Vol. II. Das Evangelium nach Markus, Lukas, Johannes. Die Apostelgeschichte. 867 pp. 1924.

For an account of *Dibelius* on James and *Windisch* on 2 Corinthians, both in Meyer's Kommentar, see below, pp. 92, 80. — In *Lietzmann's* second edition of his commentaries on Corinthians and Galatians, the improvements consist in the statement and discussion of textual variants and in the use of recent literature. See also Bultmann, ThLZ, 1924, no. 17. — Revelation, assigned to Lohmeyer, is in press. The supplementary volume, however, comprising the Apostolic Fathers, is now completed (pp. 415–644) by *Dibelius's* Shepherd of Hermas, which greatly enlarges our understanding of the composition of the work and its religious background.

Of Zahn's Commentary various volumes have appeared in new editions, as listed above, together with the first half of *Zahn's* own commentary on Revelation. In the volume on 1 Corinthians, *Bachmann* discusses Lütger's and Schlatter's hypotheses as to the theology of the Corinthian opponents, and inclines more strongly than ever to doubt the genuineness of the words ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ in 1 Cor. 1, 12. His 2 Corinthians is unchanged from the preceding edition. Galatians is revised by *F. Hauck*, with some departures from Zahn and the use of recent literature. Philippians seems not to differ from the 3rd edition. The volume on Hebrews (*Riggenbach*) has received very considerable revision, mainly in the exegesis.²³

On *Van Nes's* volume in Tekst en Uitleg on Hebrews, James, and 1 Peter, see Windisch, ThLZ, 1924, no. 6. — In a rival publication, by more orthodox Reformed theologians, have appeared so far *F. W. Grosheide* on Hebrews, with a more detailed and more theological treatment than in the Tekst en Uitleg (see ThLZ, 1923); *S. Greijdanus* on Galatians; *J. A. C. van Leeuwen* on Colossians and Thessalonians.

The Commentary on the New Testament suggested by *Strack* and written by *Billerbeck* is a standard work of German scholarship, with hardly an equal. Out of the entire

²³ See *Dibelius*, ThLZ, 1923, no. 18, and *Deissmann*, ThGg, 1922, 268.

Jewish literature (Josephus, Apocrypha, Apocalypses, and especially the Talmudic writings) it assembles all the passages that can cast any light on the text of the New Testament, whether by showing connection with Jewish thought or through the contrasted character and originality of the New Testament. It also gives, sometimes perhaps too fully, all pertinent material for Jewish archaeology and history, so far as these concern the New Testament. It is, therefore, primarily a collection of material containing rabbinical tradition and utterances on the ideas, phrases, and conceptions of the gospels. All the longer groups of citations are preceded by analyses of the material. This will supersede all earlier collections of rabbinical parallels, and the quotations and translations can be depended on. A number of fundamental ideas and problems are treated in separate excursus, and others are reserved for a concluding volume. Volume II contains long excursus on the Memra, the day of Jesus' death, and the Feast of Tabernacles, the last rather too lengthy. The value and usefulness of the work have been universally recognized.²⁴ With a book of such huge proportions it is unavoidable that some defects should be noted. In a valuable review by J. Krengel, in the *Monatsschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums*, 1924, 68-82, this Jewish scholar praises the work with some natural reservations, and gives useful comments on Billerbeck's treatment of the kingdom of God and various other topics.²⁵

II. THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

1. THE SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

Aurelius, E., *Evangeliernas uppkomst*. 76 pp. Stockholm, Sveriges kristliga studentrörelses förlag. 1921. — *Larfeld, W.*, *Darf man noch von einer Markushypothese reden?* (NKZ, xxxiii, 201-221). — *Preisker, H.*, *Sind die jüdischen Apokalypsen in den drei ersten kanonischen Evangelien literarisch verarbeitet?* (ZNTW, 1921, 199-204). — *Schulthess, F.*, *Zur Sprache der Evangelien* (ZNTW, 1922, 216-236, 241-258). — *Lindblom, J.*, *Mat-*

²⁴ See G. Kittel, DLZ, 1924, 1221 ff.; W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1923, no. 19; J. de Zwaan, NThSt, VII, 90; W. Windfuhr, ThBl, Feb. 1923.

²⁵ On the relative importance of rabbinical and apocalyptic sources for understanding the gospels see also Gressmann, *Hellenistisches oder rabbinistisches Judentum?* (ThBl, 1923, no. 6), a discussion of the views of G. F. Moore.

teusevangeliets överskrift (Festskrift for Stave, 102-109). — *Bickermann, E.*, Das Messiasgeheimnis und die Komposition des Markusevangeliums (ZNTW, 1923, 122-140). — *Werner, M.*, Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markusevangelium (ZNTW, Beiheft 1). 216 pp. 1923. — *Greijdanus, S.*, Hoofdoel en Gedachtengang van Lucas' Evangelie verhal. Rectoral address. 60 pp. Kampen, Kok, 1922. — *Moe, O.*, Spor av Johannes-traditionen hos Lukas (NoTT, XXV, 103-128). — *Refer, K.*, Der Heiland. Das Wort und Werk Jesu nach den drei ersten Evangelien. 265 pp. Berlin, Furcht-Verlag, 1924.

Aurelius describes the origin of the Synoptic Gospels, following the theory of two documentary sources. — *Larfeld* urges the great variety of reasons which make the priority of Mark almost certain. — *Preisker* concludes that Mark and Matthew were acquainted with Daniel; Matthew and Luke with Enoch 1. No literary relation to the Syriac Baruch or to 4 Esdras can be traced. The influence of the Jewish apocalypses on the gospels is therefore not important. — *Schulthess's* article supplements his "Das Problem der Sprache Jesu" (1917). In an appendix he discusses three Aramaic words: *ḥakā* (Matt. 5, 22) he would derive from *rakīk*, which signifies in Arabic a physical or moral weakling. The *rgs* in 'boanerges' (Mk. 3, 17) he connects with Syriac *rgš* ('perceive,' cf. Ps. 55, 15) and with the *ὁμόνοια* of the Septuagint (Sirach 25, 1); then *benē regeš* signifies 'fellow-thinkers' (*Gesinnungsgeossen*), like *υἱὸς εἰρήνης* in Lk. 10, 6, 'fellow-religionist,' one who uses the same formula of greeting. 'The Son of Man' goes back to a formula of humility (*hau barnāšā*, *hau gabra*, i. e. 'I') or has a general meaning ('one of us,' 'some one'); the Greek *ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου* is a theological modification after Dan. 7. Finally 'Iscariot,' since a derivation from *שׂכר* would be too violent a Hebraism, is connected with *σικαριώτης*, but must originally have been a geographical name, probably equivalent to 'man of Sychar' (hence Judas was a Samaritan!).

Lindblom thinks the title of the Gospel of Matthew is formed in the familiar Jewish way of taking for a title the initial word or some prominent word of the text, or of using some prominent theme treated in the book. He holds that the title of Matthew applies to the whole gospel. (Fr.)

Bickermann says that the problem of the 'messianic secret' in the gospels is threefold: (1) The messiahship makes itself evident, yet is intended to remain hidden and does in fact remain hidden; (2) some miracles are done openly by Jesus, others in secret; (3) the disciples are not expected to take notice, and yet at times are rebuked for not taking notice. He finds two fundamental motives (as in other prophetic legends, e.g. with the saints of the Hasidim): (a) Between revelation and appearance an interval of time, during which the hero remains silent, concealed, unknown, so that the Messiah-designate belongs to the messianic secret. (b) All miracles are known to the reader, but only certain ones to the contemporaries; in Mark the smaller miracles take place publicly, the messianic ones in secret. All the inconsistencies disappear after the recognition. The secrecy of the messiahship is due not to tradition but to the editor (Mark), who has reconciled contradictory narratives.

The influence of Pauline theology in Mark is still debated (cf. B. W. Bacon). In his thorough study, *Werner*, Privatdocent in Berne, reaches the following conclusions: Mark's agreement with Paul always relates to primitive Christian conceptions (atonement, eucharist, etc.), while parallels to specifically Pauline doctrines are either wholly lacking in Mark or else Mark takes a directly opposite view (christology, the law as capable of fulfilment, etc.). Hence Pauline theology did not influence Mark, it being assumed that the allegorical and symbolical interpretation which finds in Mark allusions to Paul is wrong.²⁶

Greijdanus treats of the plan and choice of material in Luke. The 'Longer Interpolation' contains Jesus' message of salvation. Both in character and in tendency Luke is in full accord with John.

Moe, who discusses the departures of Luke from the Synoptic type, thinks that the author had access to Johannine traditions. (Fr.)

Refer's gospel harmony is skilfully arranged.

²⁶ See also Dibelius, *ThLZ*, 1923, no. 22; Windisch, *Mus*, Sept. 1923.

2. LITERARY CRITICISM

Bultmann, R., Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (FRLanT, n. s. 12). 229 pp. 1921. — *Schmidt, K. L.*, Die Stellung der Evangelien in der allgemeinen Literaturgeschichte (Eucharisterion: Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, H. Gunkel zum 60. Geburtstag [May 23, 1922] dargebracht = FRLanT, n. s. 19. 1923. II, 51-134). — *Bertram, G.*, Die Leidensgeschichte Jesu und der Christuskult (FRLanT, n. s. 15). 1922. — *Albertz, M.*, Die synoptischen Streitgespräche. Ein Beitrag zur Formengeschichte des Urchristentums. viii, 166 pp. Berlin, Trowitsch, 1921. — *Bouma, C.*, De literarische vorm der Evangelien. Amsterdam dissertation. Rotterdam, 1921. — *Fascher, E.*, Die formgeschichtliche Methode. Eine Darstellung und Kritik. Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des synoptischen Problems (ZNTW, Beiheft 2). 236 pp. 1924. — *Brun, L.*, Nye veier i studiet av den evangeliske overlevering (NoTT, XXV, 24-43). — *Aurelius, E.*, Till frågan om den synoptiska traditionens ursprung och äldsta historia. 48 pp. Leipzig, Harrassowitz, 1923.

The systematic study of forms (*formgeschichtliche Methode*) has produced new and important results.²⁷ The most comprehensive work is that of *Bultmann*, which assigns every pericope and every logion to a definite type, examines the development of each type, and then traces the growth of the gospels. The historical origin (memory, or the invention of the Palestinian, or of the Hellenistic, community) and value of the traditions are discussed and defined. The great value of this book, which holds the first place in the gospel criticism of the last ten years, lies primarily in the grouping of the Synoptic pericopes as apophthegmata (disputations and school discourses, biographical apophthegmata); sayings of Jesus with historical setting (mostly invented by the tradition); logia (maxims, prophetic and apocalyptic sayings, legal precepts and church rules, sayings of Jesus about himself, parables, and the like); and, finally, the narrative material (grouped as miracles of healing, historical narrative, and legend). *Bultmann* analyzes every pericope, distinguishes the secondary additions, compares the types with kindred, non-christian popular literature, and sketches the historical development of each type. His assignment of all disputes and conversations to the apophthegmata seems questionable. He also exaggerates the influence of the missionary experiences of the church, and attributes too

²⁷ See Cadbury's article, HThR, 1923, 81 ff.

much to the tendency to clothe later ideas and principles in the dress of a dispute. The typology of style assigned to each group and the illustrative non-christian examples are valuable; and the account of the motives underlying the pericopes is important, especially in the case of the miracles. The foundation of the whole study is the correct observation that the gospels consist of a mosaic of pericopes — single pieces, of independent origin and independently transmitted — which were assembled and combined by the evangelists. The concluding section of the book is occupied with a study of the redaction of the traditional material, which consisted in the collecting of the logia and of the narratives, and the combination of the two. As a book, the gospel is the creation of the hellenistic church, for it presupposes the 'Kult-gemeinde' and the worship of the Christian *κύριος*, both of hellenistic origin. Bultmann here follows the well-known views of Heitmüller and Bousset. As a whole the gospel stands with no analogy; it is an original Christian creation, a part of the history of Christian dogma and worship. Compare Windisch, *Mus*, Dec. 1922; Dibelius, *DLZ*, 1922, no. 7/8; K. L. Schmidt, *ThLZ*, 1922, no. 18/19; P. Fiebig, *LZBl*, 1921, no. 40; G. Bertram, *ThBl*, 1922, no. 1; A. Loisy, *Revue d'histoire et de littérature religieuses*, 1922, 426; H. A. A. Kennedy, *ExpT*, Feb. 1923; Rauer, *ThRev*, 1923, no. 4; de Zwaan, *NThSt*, 1922, 270 ff.; van den Bergh van Eysinga, *NThT*, 1922, 347 ff.; Deissner, *ThGg*, 1922, 253 ff.

The books of *K. L. Schmidt* and *G. Bertram* attach themselves to that of Bultmann. The former seeks to define the literary genre of the Synoptic Gospels, and in opposition to Bultmann finds real analogies in other literature. After a survey of past discussion, with special reference to ancient biographies and memoirs (here taking up the points made in Votaw's article in the *American Journal of Theology*, 1915) and to ancient oriental popular literature, he maintains that the gospels represent 'minor literature' (*Kleinliteratur*), not 'higher,' or artistic, literature. They are popular books and cult-legends, not individual literary performances nor biographies. Schmidt has collected analogies, and elucidates the resemblances in

the laws followed by their development, in their style, and in their composition. He includes the later Christian literature, with its similar motives and forms, such as acts of martyrs, legends of saints, the apophthegmata patrum, and the more literary biographies of monks. Especially important are the apophthegmata patrum to which W. Bousset called attention in his posthumous work under that title (1923). Here are anecdotes and sayings, artlessly formed and artlessly combined, which in their composition may be compared with the raw material on which the evangelists worked.²⁸ Later, the legend of St. Francis in its manifold forms, the legends of saints and noted sinners (especially Dr. Faustus), have a literary history like that of the gospels. A modern analogy is found in the legends of the Hasidic rabbis collected by M. Buber. An instructive contrast is afforded by the "Tradition" of Sadhu Singh, collected and put into literary form by Streeter and Appasamy, with the help of the saint himself.²⁹

Bertram argues for his thesis concerning the cultus from the passion narrative, on which (including the Gospel of Peter) he gives a commentary based on the idea that every detail is a reflection of reverence for Jesus as the object of the church's worship (*cultus-heros*). Apologetic, paraenetic, and dogmatic motives also play their minor parts. He does not regard the passion narrative as exclusively a collection of cult-legends, but sees in it also the earliest Christian 'martyrium.' The work is not free from exaggeration; and a chief fault is the failure to distinguish between the motives effective in the formation of the tradition, among which the cult-motive had but small place, and the effect which the reading of the narratives themselves must have had on a church with an established system of worship. *Bertram's* main thesis goes too far.³⁰

Albertz, although like these other students of 'Formgeschichte' deriving his impulse from Deissmann, is far more conservative, and admits a broader and more fundamental

²⁸ The most important passages in Bousset are printed by Schmidt, pp. 104 f.

²⁹ Compare W. Michaelis in ThBl, 1922, no. 12, 5, p. 275 ff.

³⁰ See also Windisch, Mus, June, 1923; Jülicher, ThLZ, 1923, no. 1; K. L. Schmidt, ThBl, 1922, no. 9.

historical basis for the tradition. He divides the disputes in the Synoptic Gospels into those which do and those which do not involve a temptation. The passages considered are chiefly the conversations in Mk. 2; 3; 7; 10-12, with the story of the temptation, and the embassy from the Baptist, Matt. 11, 2. He shows how the form may have been built up, beginning with the actual facts of Jesus' controversial method and carried on through oral tradition to the final literary composition as we have it. The disputes were developed for the apologetic purposes of the church. He also discusses the narrative of Stephen. He tries, not quite adequately, to place the disputes of the gospels in the history of Israelite and Jewish disputation; here he might have found more abundant material if he had used the Talmud.³¹

The Amsterdam dissertation of *C. Bouma* (Reformed Church) is original but not fruitful. It is in the main a comparative criticism of the older representatives of the study of literary form in the gospels: Wetter, Wendland, Dibelius, and the rest. As an orthodox examination of the work of the 'formgeschichtliche Schule,' the study has value, but it takes no account of Bultmann and Schmidt. — *E. Fascher* makes a drastic and telling criticism of the 'formgeschichtliche Methode.' He shows how unsatisfactory is its terminology as well as the use made of it, how ill-founded is the far-reaching historical skepticism of Bultmann, how obscure is Bertram's idea of a 'kultgeschichtliche Methode.' Especially effective is his criticism of the terms 'paradigma,' 'novelle,' 'legend.' As usable terms he would retain 'dispute,' 'miracle,' 'story,' 'biographical apophthegma.' As to the distinction between 'style' and 'form,' the constitutive element of a pericope is its 'form'; the particular mode of expressing the thought is its 'style.' What remains true is that the gospels embody popular tradition in distinctive forms which constantly reappear; but to assign to these one special locus (*Sitz im Leben*) is never safe. It is, he holds, a mistake, due to the influence of Bousset, to identify what pertains to organized worship (*das Kultische*) with the Hellenistic. Indeed, the idea of 'das Kultische' is too vague to serve as an explanatory term. The error of Dibelius and Bultmann lies in

³¹ See Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 258 ff.; O. Moe, ThLBl, 1922, no. 10.

their failure to seek the locus (*Sitz im Leben*) of the disputes and stories in the life of Jesus itself. For the credibility of the tradition the history of form gives no adequate criteria. Fascher does, indeed, regard the gospels as popular books for cult-purposes (*kultische Volksbücher*). In conclusion he points out that the investigation of form may unsettle the validity of the theory of two sources.

Brun accepts 'Formgeschichte' as the whole study of the form, but warns against exaggeration and against Bultmann's historical skepticism. Style is not decisive, because it is often mixed. Not every narrative or saying that implies the absolute significance of Jesus need have been invented by the church. — *Aurelius* criticizes Dibelius and Bultmann, and insists that the actual recollections of the events and the enjoyment of the narrative were the most important factors in forming the Synoptic tradition. (Fr.)

3. COMMENTARIES

Grosheide, F. W., Het heilige evangelie volgens Mattheüs (Kommentaar op het Nieuw Testament. I). xv, 389 pp. Amsterdam, H. A. Bottenburg, 1922.

The new Dutch Commentary, in which *Grosheide's* Matthew appears, proceeds from the orthodox Reformed theologians. With exegetical science it combines the use of the New Testament for edification. The exegesis is exact, particularly in linguistic matters, and the summaries of the pericopes are useful, but the apologetic attitude is frequently in evidence. As one example, *Grosheide*, following the Johannine tradition, is disposed to deny the paschal character of the Last Supper.

III. JESUS AND THE GOSPELS

1. SURVEYS

Von Dobschütz, E., Der heutige Stand der Leben-Jesu-Forschung (ZThK, 1924, 64-84). — *Windisch, H.*, De tegenwoordige stand van het Christus-probleem (Studiënclub van moderne theologen. Vlugtschrift 1, pp. 1-24). Assen, Van Gorcum & Co., 1924. — *Bertram, G.*, Der gegenwärtige Stand der Leben-Jesu-Forschung (ChW, 1924, nos. 40/41, 42/43).

Von Dobschütz gives a critical survey of the whole field of gospel research. First he summarizes in eight theses the results of the controversy over the radical theory of a Christ-myth

(A. Drews). He emphasizes the Jewish origin of the sources of the gospels, and infers from the contradictions in the gospels and from later christological controversies that original material was here available (Jesus a man), having a character inconsistent with later views (Jesus as God). Nevertheless, critical research has now proved that a 'life of Jesus' cannot be written, but only a 'portrait of Jesus.' As to the sources, the two-source hypothesis is established. With regard to the historical use of John, there is as yet no agreement. For exegesis of the gospels it is important to keep in mind that the tradition begins with particulars; hence exegesis by the aid of the connection, as practised by A. Schweitzer, is hardly admissible. Each story and each logion is to be interpreted from itself, not from its context. His criticism of the use of the 'formgeschichtliche Methode' is that in part it rests too much on an abstract scheme which is in fact not applicable to the material in hand. The material probably took shape very early in the form of reminiscences by eye-witnesses, narratives told in a small circle of believers, even before there was a real church with organized preaching.³² Von Dobschütz then takes up the current formula: 'church theology (*Gemeindetheologie*) and the Christ-cult,' and would closely restrict the influence of these upon the tradition.³³ That Jesus was surrounded by an atmosphere of the miraculous is not to be denied. Though Schweitzer's exaggerated picture of the eschatological fanatic is to be rejected, we can yet clearly recognize in Jesus a consciousness of his messianic mission. In contrast to the inner inconsistencies which Schweitzer and others find in Jesus, von Dobschütz stresses the harmony of his nature, and his manly character.³⁴ Jesus was not the founder of a church, although in the comradeship of the disciples with their Master lie the roots of the later creation of the church. Thus arises a picture of the historical Christ which serves to supplement and correct the figure of the Christ of faith.

³² I may call attention here to the introduction to Plato's *Phaedo*. In fixing the gospel tradition, similar motives may have exerted an influence.

³³ See also his article on Deissmann's *Licht vom Osten*; see above, p. 20.

³⁴ Compare Leopoldt, *Die männliche Art Jesu*, 1918.

Windisch's article gives first a brief review of the various presentations of the personality of Christ in recent times, followed by a discussion of the question whether Jesus actually existed, and of the possibility of a modern theology relating to Jesus. Four radical arguments are examined: the absence of extra-christian evidence, the character of the Christ of the New Testament (not human but divine), the unoriginal character of the teaching of Jesus, and the inadmissibility of the method of subtraction. As to these, (1) the silence of non-christians can be partly explained (the Talmud is by no means silent), although it shows that the more incredible miracles are not historical, for over such miracles — for instance the feeding of the multitude and the raising of Lazarus — writers could not have been silent. (2) In the gospels, mythical or legendary matter mingles with non-mythical matter which is older than the cult. This last fact shows that the myth was not the earliest element. (3) Want of originality is hardly to be taken as evidence of un-historical character; moreover, it rests on very superficial comparison of parallels, especially from the Talmud. (4) The method of subtraction is entirely justified, since the gospel tradition certainly contains disparate elements and, further, the growth of the belief in Christ, or Messiah, remains psychologically unexplained if there was no historical person whom the church interpreted as the Messiah; [√]to proclaim a Messiah who had never actually come, but had existed only in imagination, or in remote antiquity, would in that age have been impossible. That in Ethiopic Enoch 71 the mythical Enoch is called the Son of Man (meaning Messiah?) — an argument which G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga (NThT, 1919, 274 ff.) has used against the writer — presents no analogy, since the author of Enoch 71 certainly saw in Enoch an historical person, and in any case this incidental identification bore no fruit; no Enoch-religion arose out of it. So the following historical data appear certain: Christianity is in its original form a prophetic-apocalyptic and prophetic-reformatory announcement, introduced by a personality who believed himself appointed and sent into the world to bear this witness. The question whether Jesus was conscious of his messiahship can remain open; it is enough to

assume that by his testimony and through his personality he made such an impression that his disciples recognized in him the Messiah. In conclusion the address treats of the significance of these views for the preaching of Jesus in our own time.³⁵

G. Bertram, in his survey, describes the presentations of the life of Jesus at the end of the last century, and then turns to the later critical study in the light of the history of religion and to literary criticism (*J. Weiss*, *Weinel*, *Bousset*), taking up reversions to the old rationalism (*E. Meyer*), impressionistic representations of Jesus (*Lepsius*, *Chamberlain*, *Blüher*), psycho-analytic studies of Jesus, the 'formgeschichtliche Methode,' the new historical portrayal (*R. Schütz*, *Jackson*, *K. Lake*, and others), in which the universalism of the prophets and the will to suffer (*Isaiah 53*) are included in the picture of Jesus, and finally *Bertram's* own 'kultgeschichtliche' conception (see above, p. 28). The writer warns against rationalizing and individualizing the figure of Jesus, and emphasizes the radical, eschatological character of Jesus' gospel and his attitude as of one alien to the secular world and critical of its civilization.³⁶

2. THE PERSONALITY AND LIFE OF JESUS

Holtzmann, O., *Christus. Zum drittenmal ausgearbeitet* (Wissenschaft und Bildung, 3). 172 pp. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer, 1922. — *Bousset, W.*, *Jesus*. 4th edition, with introduction by *K. L. Schmidt* (Religionsgeschichtliche Volksbücher I, 2. 3). 100 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1922. — *Schlatter, A.*, *Die Geschichte des Christus*. 544 pp. Stuttgart, Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1920. — *Bornhäuser, K.*, *Das Wirken des Christus durch Taten und Worte* (BFchTh, 2nd ser., vol. II). 310 pp. 1921. — *Nielsen, Ditlef*, *Den historiske Jesus*. 216 pp. Copenhagen, Aschehoug, 1924. — *Cramer, J. A.*, *Zekerheid. Een boek over Jesus Christus*. 220 pp. Zeiss, J. Ploegsma, 1921. — *Dörries, B.*, *Jesus* (Volkshochschule, vol. 42). 135 pp. Bielefeld and Leipzig, Velhagen & Klasing, 1922. — *Blüher, Hans*, *Die Aristie des Jesus von Nazareth. Philosophische Grundlegung der Lehre und der Erscheinung Christi*. 325 pp. Prien (Bavaria), Kampmann & Schnabel,

³⁵ The same journal (out of print) contains another interesting article, by *K. H. Roessingh*, professor of systematic theology at Leyden, on the data of a Christology which shall rest on the results of historical criticism. My own article has appeared in a second corrected and revised edition (77 pp.), 1925.

³⁶ Compare *K. Barth*.

1921. — *Hartmann, H.*, Jesus, das Dämonische und die Ethik. 2nd fully revised edition. 134 pp. Berlin, Der weisse Ritter, 1923. — *Zurhellen-Pfleiderer, E.*, Jesus. Roman. 331 pp. Heilbronn, Salzer, 1922. — *Hauck, A.*, Jesus. Gesammelte Vorträge. 179 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1921. — *Zündel, F.*, Jesus in Bildern aus seinem Leben. Neue Ausgabe, zweite Auflage. 390 pp. Munich, 1923.

O. Holtzmann's popular and readable book appears in a new edition. He takes in many respects a conservative point of view, holding to the messianic consciousness of Jesus, treating the confession of Peter as the turning point in the history, and defending the credibility of the first three gospels against modern skepticism. In the last chapter he traces the influence of Jesus in history. — *Bousset's* well-known book on Jesus (1904) is reprinted by anastatic process. In an introduction, K. L. Schmidt points out that the Christ of the gospels is not derived solely from the historical personality of Jesus. — *A. Schlatter's* revised edition of the first volume of his New Testament Theology (1909) was discussed in my former survey (HThR, 1922, p. 153). His effort to fashion the entire tradition into a consistent history is highly stimulating. It makes this one of the most important theological works of the last decade.³⁷

Bornhäuser, who like Schlatter connects deeds and words, endeavors to illustrate the historical figure of Jesus from the Talmud, and claims that his discoveries place the study of the gospels on a new basis. But his Jewish material either has been used before or is of doubtful value by reason of his forced interpretations, and like all the author's other books, this work, while suggestive, must be used with caution. One of his principal thoughts is that Jesus' idea of himself and of his mission was inspired by the figure of "the prophet," in which the second Moses (Dan. 8, 15 ff.) and the Servant of God are referred to. Unfortunately the proof is lacking that there was any such figure. The use of the Septuagint, especially the Greek Psalter, for interpreting the thoughts of Jesus is very arbitrary. His new method of exegesis shows itself at its worst in his explanation of the oldest word from the cross: an utterance of despair

³⁷ See W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1923, no. 4.

becomes a "word of trust in God's mercy in extremity" (Jesus knew and quoted Psalm 22 as a song of triumph). In another paper ³⁸ Bornhäuser brings the chronology of the passion into harmony with orthodox doctrine.³⁹

Nielsen, the well-known Danish student of the history of religions, has written for the general reader a book, with fine illustrations, in which he depicts Jesus as religious and ethical personality and as social reformer. Jesus was a prophet of pure humanity on religious principles; in the recognition of his real nature, which has been distorted by myth and dogma, lies the salvation of mankind. (Fr.)

Cramer, now professor of church history at Utrecht, has brought together several addresses on the investigation of the gospels and faith in Christ. He tries to combine the fundamental meaning of the faith of the church (not identical with orthodoxy) with an historical and critical treatment of the sources; that is to say, he makes certain dogmatic reservations, such as the resurrection and the divinity of Christ, and otherwise gives to criticism a free rein. He opposes the 'liberal' criticism of the gospels and the 'liberal' portrayal of Jesus. His chief objections are that the picture is too intellectualistic, moralistic, sentimental, and unoriental; that it unduly neglects the Johannine tradition, accepts too little of the Synoptic tradition, and leaves the preaching of Paul and the rise of the Christian church an unsolved riddle. At the same time he criticizes Schweitzer's one-sided eschatological conception of Jesus, and the symbolic interpretation still much favored by free-thinking theologians in Holland. This is followed by his own view. The critical discussion has some value but is nowhere adequate. — *B. Dörries*, pastor in Hanover, has made another attempt to draw a popular and liberal picture of Jesus, with emphasis on religious values, and not unsuccessfully.⁴⁰

A very original and personal product of the post-war period is the "Aristie Jesu" by *Blüher*, a leader in that group in

³⁸ See below, p. 48.

³⁹ See my review, *ThLZ*, 1922, no. 15; *Laible*, *ThLBl*, 1922, no. 21; *Deissner*, *ThGg*, 1922, 275 ff.

⁴⁰ See also *Strathmann*, *ThGg*, 1923, 273 f.

the neo-german youth-movement which makes 'Eros' its foundation. The author essays a synthesis of the Synoptic, apocryphal, and Johannine tradition, and includes in it his ideal of the personality of Jesus, founded on 'Eros.' His chief gospel is John, which he accounts both epic and biography, like Goethe's "Dichtung und Wahrheit"; its author alone, through love, understood Jesus. Into an aristocratic, Hellenic, anti-jewish social framework he forces the Johannine Christ, who becomes an epic figure like Achilles. This Christ, who represents a critical point in the history of creation, is an heroic-aristocratic figure; compassion, 'caritas', and contempt for the human race (Matt. 11, 16 ff.) characterize his attitude toward mankind. The conscious fulfilment of prophecy, use of black and white magic, Judas acting under a kind of hypnosis exercised by Jesus, are some of the writer's ideas. The eschatological teaching of Christ is only a transitional phase. Finally, Paul becomes the arch-destroyer of Christianity. In this, as at other points, the writer shows contact with Nietzsche, and his "Aristie" belongs with the great anti-christian glorifications of Christ.⁴¹

Hartmann presents the "daemonic" Jesus, and urges that the greatest of all mistakes has been to find a moral element in Jesus' preaching. A proof of the unethical character of Jesus is the fact that he does not himself observe his own supposed ethics. "Resist not evil" implies "Jenseits von Gut und Böse"; the Golden Rule is non-morality to the n-th power. While the first edition of the book (1920) ended with a philosophical discussion of ethics and daemonics, the second brings together at the close the different interpretations of Christ — ethical, cosmic, the paradoxical, and the daemonic, which is the fulfilment of its predecessors. The whole is of course a distortion of the Synoptic Jesus, but it draws attention to some elements of the tradition, often overlooked in the exclusively ethical and human interpretation of his character.⁴²

The book by *E. Zurhellen-Pfleiderer*, daughter of Otto Pfleiderer and well-trained in theology, is a romance of the life of Jesus. The guiding motive is the messianic consciousness

⁴¹ See also Pöhlmann, ChW, 1921, no. 31.

⁴² See also Bultmann, ThBl, 1924, no. 7.

which was the ultimate cause of his death. No character in the life-like pages of this charming book is fictitious except some Galilean rabbis and Pharisees. The concluding chapter, Jesus in Jerusalem, is especially affecting.⁴³

The book by *Hauck*, late professor of church history at Leipzig, is a collection of addresses. The titles are: "Hat Jesus gelebt?" (1901); "Jesus und Paulus" (1908); "Jesus in seinem Fühlen und Denken"; "Jesus in seinem Handeln"; "Jesus in seinem Leiden."⁴⁴ — *Zündel*, whose book is a reprint of an old one, is the biographer of Blumhardt, and one of those older witnesses to the gospel who are highly esteemed in the circle of Barth.

3. THE RADICAL CHRIST-MYTH

Drews, A., Das Markusevangelium als Zeugnis gegen die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu. 326 pp.; Der Sternhimmel in der Dichtung und Religion der alten Völker und des Christentums. 320 pp.; Die Entstehung des Christentums aus dem Gnostizismus. 390 pp.; Die Christusmythe. Fully rewritten edition. 12th to 14th thousand. 238 pp. Jena, Diederichs, 1921, 1923, 1924, 1925. — *Raschke*, Hermann, Die Werkstatt des Markusevangeliums. 330 pp. Jena, Diederichs, 1924. — *Hertlein*, Eduard, Was wissen wir von Jesus? 39 pp. Stuttgart-Cannstadt, Rössler & Kiesser, 1922. — *Van den Bergh van Eysinga*, G. A., De oude aftrek methode in een nieuwen vorm (NThT, 1924, 391-397). — *Leipoldt*, J., Hat Jesus gelebt? 47 pp. Leipzig, Dörflinger & Franke, 1920. — *Weinel*, H., Die Geschichtlichkeit Jesu (Quellenbücher der Volkshochschule 5). 32 pp. Langensalza, Beyer, 1920.

A. *Drews* is untiring in defending and developing his radical conception of Christ, and the first three books mentioned above form a connected series. The first aims to demonstrate the wholly unhistorical character of the "oldest gospel," every part of which owes its origin to Old Testament learning and astro-mythology. The discussion by which, after D. F. Strauss, he tries to show relations of the pericopes to Old Testament passages may have some value, but is greatly exaggerated, and the whole astral theory of his several works seems to me futile. The use of a sun-myth to explain the Gospel of Mark, most elaborately carried through in detail and illustrated with twelve

⁴³ See Strathmann, ThGg, 1923, 271 ff.

⁴⁴ See ThLZ, 1922, no. 4.

monthly charts of the heavens, is merely fanciful.⁴⁵ — The second book elaborates further the astro-mythical theory, showing its use for the mythology of the Greeks and Germans, and applying it in the New Testament to Matthew and John. Luke alone is supposed not to have understood it and so to have ruined the astral outline in the history of Jesus. In the myth of the Argonauts, as in the gospels, the narrative follows the course of the sun through the signs of the zodiac; Mithraism also has an astro-mythical background. — Drews's third book gives a constructive account of the rise of Christianity in the *milieu* of Jewish gnosticism (Friedländer) and apocalyptic circles. The figure of Christ was evolved from a blending of the gnostic Redeemer with the suffering Servant of God. The earliest "Christian" representatives of Jewish gnosticism are the gnostic writings of Justin, the Epistle of Jude, the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Epistle of James, Revelation, and the Odes of Solomon, all being documents in which the historical Jesus scarcely appears at all.⁴⁶ Christianity proper appears in the oldest Paulinism. Here Drews admits genuine Pauline portions at least in Romans and 1 and 2 Corinthians, accepting those passages which teach a simpler christology and soteriology.⁴⁷ This genuine Paul, however, serves to disprove the historical character of Jesus, since his Christ-drama does not rest on the gospel narrative. For the transformation of the mythical into the historical Jesus the earliest documents are the Synoptic Gospels. More interesting than this historical construction is the criticism by Drews, as a pupil of Eduard von Hartmann, on the character of Jesus. Compare also his characterization of the Johannine Christ (pp. 353 ff.). In John gnosis and speculation again have full play; in the fundamental principle of Hegelian philosophy Drews sees the real heart of the Gospel of John. — In addition to these three new books which embody his recent studies, Drews has also issued his "Christus-mythe" in a new form. It is essentially a reprint of Part I,

⁴⁵ See Lohmeyer, DLZ, 1922, no. 20; Bertram, ThBl, 1922, no. 12.

⁴⁶ This cannot be said of Hebrews. See my excursus, 'Christusmythe und geschichtlicher Jesus im Hebräerbrief,' p. 27, in Der Hebräerbrief (Lietzmann's Handbuch), 1913.

⁴⁷ So D. Völter, Paulus und seine Briefe, 1905.

supplemented by material from Part II, and with much of the controversial matter omitted.

Drews has found a fellow-worker and rival in the Bremen pastor *H. Raschke*. His method for understanding Mark and the rise of the gospel narratives may be called an etymological camouflage, based on Palestinian geography. With great ingenuity and by retranslation into Aramaic or Hebrew, he operates with plays on geographical names as having determined not merely the form but also the contents of the gospels. Only less improbable than this part of his theory is his idea that Mark is Marcion's Gospel,⁴⁸ in spite of the ignorance or blindness on the part of Tertullian which such a theory involves. It is evident that in Raschke the gnostic spirit of Volkmar lives again.⁴⁹

Hertlein's address uses the customary arguments of those who try to show that there is no sufficient evidence for thinking that Jesus existed. As in his earlier writings (*Der Daniel der Römerzeit*, 1908; *Die Menschensohnfrage im letzten Stadium*, 1911; cf. Lagarde, GGA, 1891, p. 497 ff.), he holds that the term Son of Man was introduced into Daniel after the year 70 and later came into the gospels.

G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga enters the lists against my denunciation of the mythical theory (see above, pp. 32 f.). The "foundation pillars" of Schmiedel are untenable (Mk. 10, 18 for instance shows Hermetic influence; cf. Corp. Herm. II and VI). The method of subtraction is a *petitio principii*, since it assumes that the gospels do include some historical material. The use of 'Son of Man' in Enoch proves that the appearance of the Messiah could be connected with mythological personages. See my rejoinder in the second edition of my book (above, p. 32).

The only recent critical discussion of Drews is *J. Leipoldt's* book. He emphasizes the extra-christian testimony of the Talmud, which he knows well, and uses the Palestinian and Aramaic background of the gospels. He regards the hostile arguments drawn from the history of religions as the weightiest

⁴⁸ See also his article, 'Markion und sein Evangelium,' in NThT, 1923, 28 ff.

⁴⁹ See also A. Jülicher, DLZ, 1924, no. 11; Dibelius, ThLZ, 1924, no. 18.

part of the attack. Discussing the supposed influence of the myths of death and resurrection of gods, he finds their relation to the New Testament tradition to be but slight. In this connection he examines the important new text of the suffering and triumph of Bel-Marduk which H. Zimmern published in the *Berichte* of the Leipzig Academy for 1918. Even if allusions to foreign myths are present in the gospels, they do not bring the historical character of the whole narrative into doubt. He rejects the contentions of Drews and Friedländer concerning a Jewish Gnosis and its connection with apocalyptic, and denies (hardly with reason) that Philo, in his *De posteritate Caini*, testifies to the existence of a Cainite sect. In conclusion he sets forth the contrast between Jesus and the Judaism of the Talmud: conception of the Messiah, idea of the Kingdom, attitude toward reward and merit, piety of the heart, novelty of Jesus' moral precepts and social attitude. The discussion lacks largeness in its point of view and does not always succeed in refuting Drews, but in detail the citation of sources and the carefully weighed judgments will be serviceable.

H. Weinell has brought together in German translation important sources for the question of the historical character of Jesus: the extra-christian testimonies, apocryphal traditions, evidence for a pre-christian "Jesus" and on the problem of Nazareth, on the myths which are supposed to have given rise to the gospels, passages from Seneca and from the Talmud supposed to resemble the gospels, and the description of the Essenes in Josephus, B. J. ii. 8.

4. THE GOSPEL NARRATIVES

a. *Infancy of Jesus*

Gunkel, H., Die Lieder in der Kindheitsgeschichte Jesu bei Lukas (Festgabe für Harnack, 43-60). Tübingen, Mohr, 1921. — Kuhn, G., Die Geschlechtsregister Jesu bei Lukas und Matthäus (ZNTW, 1923, 206-228); Untersuchungen über die richtige Textgestalt von Matth. 1, 16 (NKZ, 1923, 362-385). — Gerhardt, O., Der Stern des Messias. Das Geburts- und Todesjahr Jesu Christi nach astronomischer Berechnung. 144 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1922. — Caspari, W., Ναῦμαλος Matth. 2, 23, nach alttestamentlichen Voraussetzungen (ZNTW, 1922, 122-127). — Roos, A. G., Volkstellungen in Egypte en Lukas 2, 1-5 (NThSt, v, 1-7). — Sickenberger, J., Zur Quiriniusfrage (BiblZ, xvi, 215 f.). — Dessau, H., Zu den neuen Inschriften

des Sulpicius Quirinius (Klio, xvii, 252-258). — *Bleekmann, F.*, Die erste Statthalterschaft des P. Sulpicius Quirinius (Klio, xvii, 106-112).

Gunkel has studied appreciatively the style of the hymns in Luke 1 ff. After a survey of the forms of Old Testament hymns, he shows that the passages Luke 1, 46-47, 49-55, and 68-75 are eschatological hymns of purely Jewish character, while 1, 48 and 76-79 are Christian additions which mar the unity of style in the canticles.

The most interesting result of the examination of the genealogies of Jesus by *G. Kuhn*, a Swiss pastor, is his discovery that in Luke 3 two lists have been combined: Jesus, Joseph, Eli, Matthat, Levi, etc. (3, 23-26) and Jesus, Eliezer, Jorim, Matthat, Levi, etc. (3, 29-31). Less plausibly he urges that the common ground of the two is a genealogy of Mary. It further appears that Luke 3, 25 f. is an excerpt from 1 Chron. 3, 19-24, and that Luke 3, 27 f. is a corrupt reproduction of 1 Chron. 3, 17 f. The lists in Matthew and Luke have been considerably altered in order to produce hebdomads. — The same writer argues that the common text of Matt. 1, 16 is the true one. The Dialogue between Timotheus and Aquila presupposes the text lacking the words *καὶ Ἰωσήφ ἐγέννησεν τὸν Ἰησοῦν*, which are to be taken as an arbitrary addition of the Jew in the Dialogue. The passage of Bar Salibi is to be translated: "think not . . . that when he came to Joseph he meant that Joseph had begotten the Messiah." And the reading in the Sinaitic Syriac is merely an emphatic statement that Joseph, before God and man, was the lawful father of Jesus; the spiritual coöperation of Joseph in the birth of Jesus (Matt. 1, 18 ff.) is termed 'begetting' by the Syriac.

After an account of ancient astrology, *O. Gerhardt* attempts to show that Matt. 2 means that a star of special significance for Israel and for its religion arose, made a characteristic conjunction, and entered a definite sign of the zodiac. From mediaeval sources he concludes that the star must have been Saturn in conjunction with Jupiter, and that the sign of the zodiac was Pisces. Hence, by an exact astronomical reckoning, Jesus was born in the year 7 B.C. The author next tries to fix the year of the crucifixion by calculating the year in which

the 15th of Nisan fell on a Friday; and finds the most probable date to be April 7, A.D. 30, with April 27, A.D. 31 also possible. Although one may remain skeptical, especially as to the calculation about the star, yet so exact and conscientious a work has value.⁵⁰

W. Caspari thinks that Matt. 2, 23 relates to the prophecy of Isa. 11, 1, with a play on נָצַר (perhaps taken as נָצוּר or נָצִיר), 'unnoticed' or 'watched,' and also 'inhabitant of Nazareth.' — *Roos*, following *Wilcken* (*Chrestom. der Papyruskunde* I, 1, 192 f., 233 f.) and others, describes the arrangements of the Egyptian census and gives in translation the most important texts (edicts and tax returns). — *Sickenberger* supports the theory of a brachylogy in Lk. 2, 2 (for αὕτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ προτέρα ἐγένετο ἢ ἡγεμονεῦεν τῆς Συρίας Κυρήνιον), and gives New Testament parallels.

Bleckmann and *Dessau* both discuss the inscription of Pisidian Antioch relating to the appointment of Quirinius as duumvir of the city. *Bleckmann* accepts *Ramsay's* dating (*Expositor*, 1912), but puts Quirinius's first governorship of Syria in 11-9 or 11-10, not 9-8 B.C., and thinks it impossible that he took a census then as well as later. — *Dessau* would assign the honor to Quirinius as duumvir rather to the period of governorship of C. Caesar, whom Quirinius accompanied. He assigns the first governorship of Quirinius to the years 11-9 B.C.

b. Public Ministry (General)

Dieckmann, H., Das fünfzehnte Jahr des Tiberius, Lk. 3, 1 (BiblZ, 16, 54-65). — *Cichorius, C.*, Chronologisches zum Leben Jesu (ZNTW, 1923, 16-19). — *Dalman, G.*, Orte und Wege Jesu (BFchTh, 2nd ser. 1). 2nd edition. viii, 321 pp. 1924. — *Mpratsiotes, P. J.*, 'Ο 'Ιουδαϊκὸς ὄχλος ἐν τοῖς εὐαγγελίοις. 60 pp. Athens, 1923.

Dieckmann shows that in Lk. 3, 1 neither ancient writers and coins nor the usage for ἡγεμονεῦεν justifies the idea that the joint rule of Tiberius was used for dating purposes. — *Cichorius*, in order to make possible the birth of Jesus under Herod the Great, argues that the Syrians reckoned the first

⁵⁰ See also *Hönnicke*, ThLZ, 1924, no. 2; *Sickenberger*, BiblZ, XVI, 255, objects that we do not know which were the intercalary years.

year of Tiberius from August 14 to October 1, A.D. 14, so that his fifteenth year was October, 27 to October, 28. — *Dalman* has made many additions to his valuable book.⁵¹ — *Mpratsiotes* is a Greek theologian versed in German and English theology. It is instructive to read rabbinical traditions in a Greek translation. A useful feature of his book is the collection of all the data in the gospels relating to the popular religious ideas and expectations and to the attitude of the people toward Jesus.⁵²

c. *Jesus in Galilee*

Gressmann, H., Die Sage von der Taufe Jesu und die vorderorientalische Taubengöttin (AR, 1921, 1-40, 323-359). — *Eitrem, S.*, Die Versuchung Christi. Mit Nachwort von A. Fridrichsen. 37 pp. Christiania, Grøndahl, 1924. — *Violet, B.*, Der Aufbau der Versuchungsgeschichte Jesu (Harnack-Ehrung 14-21). — *Dalman, G.*, Jesu-Jeschua. 222 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922. — *Jelke, R.*, Die Wunder Jesu. 125 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1922. — *Sulzer, G.*, Die Besessenheitsheilungen Jesu. 52 pp. Leipzig, O. Mutze, 1921. — *Bornhäuser, K.*, Zur Perikope vom Bruch des Sabbat (NKZ, 1922, 325-334). — *Windisch, H.*, "En hij wilde hen voorbijgaan," Mk. 6, 48 (NThT, 1920, 298-308). — *Völter, D.*, Noch eine Erklärung von Markus 6, 48 (NThT, 1921, 28-35). — *Aurelius, E.*, Några ord om Cäsarea Philippi-perikopen (Festskrift for Stave, 315-320). — *Von Harnack, A.*, Die Verklärungsgeschichte Jesu, der Bericht des Paulus (1 Kor. 15, 3 ff.) und die beiden Christusvisionen des Petrus (SAB, 1922, 62-80). — *Lohmeyer, E.*, Die Verklärung Jesu nach dem Marcus-evangelium (ZNTW, 1922, 185-214).

According to *Gressmann*, the baptism of Jesus is to be classed with legends of the calling of kings. Originally the subject of εἶδεν was the Baptist; the Gospel of John knew it in that form, and the conclusion ran thus: "Then John bowed his knee before Jesus and confessed that he was not worthy to bear his sandals," etc. Among the uncanonical forms of the story *Gressmann* includes the Odes of Solomon 24. Even in its original form the story was a legend; John did not recognize Jesus as the Messiah (cf. however Matt. 11, 2 ff.) nor did Jesus' consciousness of his messiahship date from the baptism. The material is non-israelite; and from foreign sources come the incarnation of the deity in the form of a bird and the idea of the king as the Beloved and as Son of God. The motive of the

⁵¹ See Guthe, ThLZ, 1922, no. 14; Bultmann, ThBl, 1923, no. 5.

⁵² See von Dobschütz, ThLZ, 1924, no. 20.

choice of a king by a bird is not confined to any one nation. Finally, the author tries to show that the dove is a survival of the Assyrian dove-goddess Ishtar.

Eitrem explains the story of the temptation by reference to magic and the like. The second temptation ("Cast thyself down," etc.) is a reminiscence of ritual leaps, in which priests or magicians showed their daemonic power. Psalm 91, which the tempter quotes, promises power over demons, and Christ is here refusing to perform a magical or devilish miracle. In the third temptation Satan appears in the rôle of Typhon as it is described by Nonnus in the *Dionysiaca* i. 444 ff. The first temptation is obviously to perform a purely magical act. In the whole story the primitive Christian church tried to express in its own way the attitude of Christ toward magic.⁵³ In a suggestive postscript to *Eitrem's* book, *Fridrichsen* compares Q and Mark, emphasizing the apologetic interest of the story of the temptation as a refutation of the charge that Jesus employed magical arts. The story is significant for the whole tradition of the miracles, and has two contrasted purposes, namely, to enhance and to limit belief in miracles.

Violet interprets all three temptations as incitements to the use of power: over nature, over men, and over God. The temptation on the pinnacle of the temple relates to the promise that the Messiah shall stand on the top of Mount Zion (4 Ezra 13, 33 ff.); Jesus is to put pressure on God to help him and to fulfil more speedily the plans cherished by men for the world's bliss.

Dalman's book takes the place of a second volume of his "Worte Jesu" (I, 1898). It deals with five themes: the three languages, Jesus in the synagogue, on the Mount, at the Last Supper, and on the Cross. (1) Besides Aramaic, Jesus could speak Greek, since he talked with Pilate without an interpreter; and he could read and speak Hebrew. Dalman collects interesting testimonies to the religious use of Aramaic and to the use of Hebrew under the influence of scribes and school. In opposition to Schulthess, he holds that the Targum and the Aramaic portion of the Jerusalem Talmud are the best means for knowing the language of Jesus. (2) After a description of

⁵³ See E. Peterson, *ThLZ*, 1925, no. 18, who rejects this explanation.

the synagogue and its service, he gives an excellent exposition of Lk. 4, 16 ff. (cf. I. Abrahams, *Studies in Pharisaism and the Gospels*, I, 1917) and brings out the contrast between Jesus and the rabbis. (3) A talmudic commentary follows on Matt. 5, 17-22, valuable, but ignoring some of the exegetical problems. (4) The longest section is on the Last Supper. Dalman insists (against Zahn) that John separates the Last Supper from the passover, and he discusses the reasons for the modification of the tradition. He further describes the preparation for the passover supper and the meal itself, and explains the fragmentary statements of the Synoptic Gospels. The point of chief interest is the translation of the words of institution into Aramaic, with a commentary. In opposition to Jewish scholars, Dalman shows how the idea of a vicarious death grew out of the Old Testament and can also be illustrated from the Talmud. (5) The fifth section deals with the account of crucifixion in the Talmud, the gospel story of the crucifixion, and especially the seven words from the cross, which are translated into Aramaic. A useful appendix collects Jewish proverbs and maxims.⁵⁴

Jelke writes on the miracles as a systematic theologian, but also discusses the treatment of the gospel stories by the 'form-geschichtliche Schule' and its effect on the criticism of the miracles, refusing to accept the explanation of the miraculous as the invention of tradition or as the intrusion of legend.⁵⁵ — *Sulzer* is an occultist and defends the miracle stories from the point of view of a belief in present-day possession by demons and in spiritistic phenomena.

Bornhäuser seeks to explain the story of sabbath-breaking, Mk. 3, 1-6, and especially the statement there made of the purpose of the Jews to put Jesus to death, by citing the rule of the Talmud that violation of the Sabbath is punishable by death if it has been intentional and if a warning has been given beforehand. This warning Bornhäuser sees in the first encounter, on the preceding Sabbath.

H. Windisch attempts to give a more satisfactory explan-

⁵⁴ See W. Bauer, *ThLZ*, 1923, no. 2; Gressmann, *ThBl*, 1923, no. 12.

⁵⁵ See also Strathmann, *ThGg*, 1923, 278 f.; K. L. Schmidt, *ThBl*, 1922, no. 12; Bultmann, *ThLZ*, 1923, no. 8.

ation of the incident in Mk. 6, 47 (peculiar to Mark) of Jesus' walking on the water. Jesus seems for a moment to hesitate to enter the boat and help the disciples. This feature recalls his demeanor during the storm (Mk. 4, 38), toward the Syrophoenician women (Matt. 15, 22), and toward the sick of Capernaum (Mk. 1, 35 ff.), as well as his exclamation in Mk. 9, 19 ff. Everywhere is the same motive, the desire to withdraw from those who sought his aid, and a conflict appears between the need of solitude for the Lord who stood above humanity, and the necessities of that humanity. Perhaps the motive of the secret of the messiahship is also present. According to Mk. 6, 45, Jesus constrained his disciples to go on board. Was this in order that they might not see that he could walk on the water? We are reminded of a motive that occurs in the fairy tale of Cupid and Psyche and in the legend of the fair Melusina.

Völter has a different explanation. He compares Mk. 6, 45-52 (Matt. 14, 22-33) with John 21, 1-14, and sees in it an anticipatory Easter-narrative. That Jesus passes them by is a sign of his displeasure because of the faithlessness of the disciples at the time of the passion.

Aurelius affirms, against Bultmann, the unity of Mk. 8, 27-33, pointing out that the sharp rebuke to Peter in vs. 33 must be good tradition and is closely connected with what preceded. (Fr.)

Harnack, like Eduard Meyer,⁵⁶ finds the story of the transfiguration of fundamental importance for the origin of the resurrection faith. It is founded on a vision of Peter, which is simply an anticipation of the fulfilment of the Jewish hope of the Kingdom of God. The incident cannot be derived (as by Wellhausen) from the tradition of Easter; rather the resurrection vision has its roots in the transfiguration vision. But before the transfiguration comes the recognition of Jesus as the Messiah. This explanation is built up on an acute analysis of 1 Cor. 15, 3 ff. and the appearances there mentioned.⁵⁷

Quite different is *Lohmeyer's* analysis of the transfiguration narrative in Mark. He sees in it a combination of two

⁵⁶ Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums, II, 156. See below, pp. 95 ff.

⁵⁷ See also Jülicher, ThLZ, 1922, no. 16/17.

separate accounts: (a) the appearance of Moses and Elias, who talk with Jesus, and (b) the "transformation" of Jesus. The former (a) rests entirely on Jewish messianic ideas; the appearance of Moses and Elias and the theophany are all eschatological events. They signify that salvation and the Messiah are come, and that Jesus is the Messiah. This must be very old, since Elijah and John the Baptist are not yet brought into relation. The second (b) is a mythical christophany after hellenistic models.

d. *Jesus in Jerusalem*

Jeremias, Joachim, Jerusalem zur Zeit Jesu. I: Die wirthschaftlichen Verhältnisse; II: Die sozialen Verhältnisse. A. Reich und Arm. 97, 64 pp. Leipzig, Pfeiffer, 1923, 1924. — *Violet, B.*, Die "Verfluchung" des Feigenbaums (Eucharisterion, II, 135-140). — *Haas, Hans*, "Das Scherflein der Witwe" und seine Entsprechung im Tripitaka. Mit Anhang: Bibliographie zur Frage nach den Beziehungen zwischen Buddhismus und Christentum (Veröffentlichungen des Forschungs-instituts für Religionsgeschichte zu Leipzig 5). 175 pp., 8 pls., 23 illus., map. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922. — *Bornhäuser, K.*, Zeiten und Stunden in der Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte. Zum Petrusbekenntnis und zur Hohenpriesterfrage (BFchTh, 26, 4). 82 pp. 1921. — *Hommel, E.*, Ein uralter Hochzeitsbrauch im Neuen Testament (ZNTW, 1924, 305-310). — *Von Sybel, L.*, Die Salbungen, Matt. 26, 6-13; Mk. 14, 3-9; Lk. 7, 36-50; John 12, 1-8 (ZNTW, 1924, 184-192); Das letzte Mahl Jesu (ThStKr, 95, 1923, 116-124). — *Frischkopf, B.*, Die neuesten Erörterungen über die Abendmahlsfrage (NA, IX, 4.5). 188 pp. — *Goetz, K. G.*, Der Sonderbericht über die Feier des Abendmahls in Bethanien in ausserkanonischer Ueberlieferung (ZNTW, 1921, 169 f.). — *Lippert, G.*, Pilatus als Richter. 36 pp. Vienna, Oesterreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1923. — *Wandel, —*, Zur Lage des neutestamentlichen Golgotha (ThStKr, 1922, 132-161). — *Laible, H.*, Der zerrissene Tempelvorhang und die eingestürzte Oberschwelle des Tempeleingangs vom Talmud bezeugt (NKZ, 1924, 287-314). — *Hoffmann, R. A.*, Das Geheimnis der Auferstehung Jesu. 167 pp. Leipzig, O. Mutze, 1921. — *Albertz, M.*, Zur Formgeschichte der Auferstehungsberichte (ZNTW, 1922, 259-269). — *Sasse, H.*, Die erste Erscheinung des Auferstandenen (ThBl, 1922, no. 3). — *Brun, L.*, Die Auferstehung Christi in der urchristlichen Ueberlieferung. 97 pp. Christiania, Aschehoug, 1924. — *Bickermann, E.*, Das leere Grab (ZNTW, 1924, 281-292).

Using Jewish sources for the time before the wars of 66-70, *J. Jeremias* gives a good summary of economic conditions in Jerusalem — with chief reference to handicrafts, especially in connection with the temple worship, and the exports and imports. As against the figure of 2,700,000 participants in the

passover given by Josephus (B. J. vi. 9), he estimates at most 180,000, of whom 125,000 were pilgrims. The second part discusses social conditions.⁵⁸

Violet holds that the original narrative of the cursing of the fig-tree contained no imprecation or curse, but only an exclamation of disappointment and grief: "the Son of Man will never again enjoy thy fruit!"

The work of *Haas* is of unusual importance in itself and in its method. The Indian "parallels" to the widow's mite have long been known, but for the first time Haas gives a trustworthy text and accurate interpretation of them, from which it appears that all previous judgments have rested on a false text. He formulates the principles to be observed in such a comparison, establishes the possibility of Indian influence in the gospels, and concludes that the two traditions were connected and arose in India. The story was first taken over into Luke and thence interpolated into Mark. Twenty appendices discuss, among many other subjects, Buddhist parallels to the church as a ship and to the miracles of feeding, and Talmudica. The author's argument is not altogether successful and his Synoptic theory is improbable.⁵⁹

Bornhäuser attacks the problems of the passion and resurrection narratives, but seems to me to increase the prevailing confusion as to the chronology. The Last Supper was not the passover, for (to mention his best argument) Jesus and his disciples left the house during the night, which was forbidden after the passover. The condemnation by the Sanhedrim was to excommunication, not to death. The confession of Peter and that of Jesus mean 'Son of Jahveh,' which is more than 'Son of God,' since the latter term includes both men and angels. That Jesus accepted Peter's confession was what Judas betrayed. Jesus' confirmation of this to the high priests and his utterance of 'the name' was his blasphemy.

Hommel connects the two parties of five virgins each in the parable (Matt. 25) with the number five of the ancient bridal

⁵⁸ See my review in NThT, 1924, 72 f.; Hänel, ThLBl, 1924, no. 1.

⁵⁹ For Kittel's view that the incident of the widow was originally a genuine parable of Jesus, but drawn by him from an Indian source, see ThLBl, 1923, 358 ff. See also W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1923, no. 2; G. A. v. d. Bergh v. Eysinga, NThT, 1924, 163-172.

choruses. The latter is of astrological origin, the bridal pair and the five virgins representing sun, moon, and five planets.

Von Sybel gives an interesting analysis of the story of the anointing at Bethany. The earliest account is that of Mark and Matthew; but Matt. 26, 12 f. and Mk. 14, 8 f. are a christological addition, to be associated with the inclusion of the pericope in the passion narrative and with its localization in Bethany. Luke has worked the story over into that of the woman who was a sinner, following as a motive the interest of the disciples — not Jesus! — in forgiving sins. — In his second book, *von Sybel* starts from the two mutually exclusive representations of the Last Supper in the gospel narratives — as a paschal and as an ordinary meal. He infers that the primitive gospel, like John, did not originally include the Last Supper. The symbolism of the bread and wine with its reference to the crucifixion as an offering for sin is what gives the formula of institution its peculiar character, and this is the invention of Paul. Jesus' own idea at the Last Supper was to maintain the common meal among the disciples, and to preserve this fellowship with himself.

Frischkopf has made a good critical summary of recent discussion of the Last Supper in every possible aspect, beginning with the text and ending with the significance of the Supper and the critical denial that it took place at all. For German works it is almost complete, but some of the English and American investigations have been overlooked. — W. Haupt had already conjectured (*Worte Jesu und Gemeindeüberlieferung*, 1913) that the source of Mark transferred the Last Supper to Bethany. To this same source *Goetz* would refer the account in the Apostolic Constitutions, where Martha and Mary appear as participants.

G. Lippert, a jurist, is interested in the responsibility of Pilate as judge, and reconstructs as the basis of Mark and Luke a report of Pilate on the proceedings against Jesus, which Mark and the author of Luke's source might have seen. In Pilate's attitude he sees grave violation of his judicial duty.

Wandel attacks the genuineness of the traditional Golgotha. He derives the name from *Goah* (Jer. 31, 39); *gol* is originally

Aramaic *gal* ('stone-heap'); *goatha* is 'locative.' Hence the derivation of Golgotha from *gulgoleth* is popular etymology. He holds that the north wall in the time of Jesus (the second wall of Josephus) ran outside the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but the goah-plateau must have lain inside the present Wall of Agrippa. That the tolerant Hadrian should have erected a temple of Venus on the site of the grave of Christ, he thinks unlikely; in his time that site lay hidden under débris and could not have been found. The palace of Pilate Wandel identifies with the palace of Herod. The etymology proposed does not seem to me so doubtful as do the further arguments.

The talmudic evidence for the rending of the veil of the temple, which *Laible* claims to have discovered, is the single notice in M. Joma 5, 1, according to which two curtains were hung up before the holy of holies. This, he thinks, refers to an exceptional event, the occasion for which — the rending of the veil at the death of Jesus — the Talmud has suppressed. This event is to be included with the other prodigies that occurred "forty years before the destruction of the temple" of which the Talmud and Josephus speak (Jer. Joma 43c; B. J. vi. 5, 3). The breaking of the lintel, mentioned in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, occurred at the same time as the rending of the veil before the holy of holies; it caused, *Laible* thinks, the hanging up of a curtain before the sanctuary at the entrance of the vestibule, and of this the Talmud also makes mention. An echo of this story he finds in the accounts of prodigies at the death of famous rabbis.⁶⁰

R. A. Hoffmann of Vienna is the first professor of theology to try to explain the story of the resurrection by the phenomena of occultism. He begins with an interesting criticism of the traditions. The account in 1 Cor. 15 is trustworthy and complete; the testimony of the women and the discovery of the empty tomb are later legend. All the appearances of Jesus took place in Galilee, even that to the disciples at Emmaus (the mention of the place is secondary); one of the two disciples was Peter (λέγοντες in Lk. 24, 34 is original). The appearances cannot have been visions, but must have been so real as at once to

⁶⁰ Compare Delitzsch, *Zeitschrift für lutherische Theologie*, 1855, 401 ff.

convince the disciples of the resurrection. These appearances are instances of corporeal manifestation, for which Hoffmann adduces parallels. The motive for the appearances of Jesus was concern for the disciples and for his unfinished work.⁶¹

Albertz analyzes the form of the reports of appearances. He distinguishes various classes: catechism-like summaries of faith, apostolic christophanies, christophanies as 'recognitions,' appearances of angels, post-dated narratives (John 21, 1 ff.), proofs of the resurrection, narratives properly so called of the resurrection (Matt. 27, 62-66; 28, 11-15; Gospel of Peter 8-11), narratives of continuous intercourse with the risen Christ, ante-dated resurrection-narratives (baptism? transfiguration?) He then discusses certain individual motives and from the formal analysis draws inferences as to the history.

Somewhat like D. Völter (see above, p. 46), *H. Sasse* sees in the story of Jesus walking on the water the earliest Easter narrative. He supports this view in part by the description in John 6, the motive of the test of Peter's faith in Matt. 14, and the special features in Mk. 6.

Brun's important study of the style of the resurrection narratives reaches instructive conclusions. Under the confused mass of details, a simple scheme is to be found, framed by the working of a few main motives and several subordinate ones. Of all this he gives a masterly analysis which presents drastic criticisms of previous historical constructions. In its strict objectivity, this thorough piece of work brings out impressively the principle that in making any historical inquiry the motives and history of the tradition must first be elucidated. Brun's view is as follows: 1. In the stories of the tomb a two-fold chief motive is present: (a) proof of the resurrection (Jesus is no longer in the tomb) and (b) the message to the disciples. Secondary motives are the witnesses, the first day of the week, anointing, mourning, appearance of angels, fear, disbelief, opening of the tomb, recollection of prophecies, writing (*Schrift-motiv*). 2. In the appearances a fixed underlying scheme is always to be traced, though often modified, namely, appear-

⁶¹ See Frick, ChW, 1922, no. 9; Th. Steinmann, ThLZ, 1922, no. 14; K. L. Schmidt, ThBl, Jan. 1922; K. Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 249 ff.

ance to a single person and then to a group. The chief motive of the appearance to a single person (first appearance) is the confirmation of the fact of the resurrection; the secondary motives are the same as in the stories of the tomb. The appearance to a group takes a double form, vision and 'hearing.' The Lord (1) appears, (2) testifies to his resurrection, rebukes unbelief, gives instructions for missionary work, utters promises. The elaboration of these common elements shows great variety (kerygmatic; condensed résumés; large pictures; dialogue, etc.). To the earlier motives are now added mountain, lake, closed doors, doubt, greeting, touching, the meal (in combination with the vision); further, ascension, mission-promise (this a matter of 'hearing'). Compared with the firm unity of the fundamental scheme, the topographical and chronological differences of the several sources are unimportant. As to the question of Jerusalem or Galilee, there were appearances in both places, but after the tradition had received its definite fundamental form, a choice between the two places had to be made. An appendix discusses the ascension. (Fr.)

Bickermann compares Mark's tradition of the empty tomb with the ancient type of legends of removal of bodies from tombs. In these the empty grave was the proof of removal; very different is the story of the resurrection, which is based on the appearances, while the ideas connected with mere removal, to say the least, do not necessarily require the conception of an epiphany. Mk. 16, 8 is not a story of resurrection, but of removal. The Pauline formula (1 Cor. 15) is of hellenistic origin and inherited from the Mysteries.

5. THE SAYINGS OF JESUS

a. *The Sermon on the Mount*

Bornhäuser, K., Die Bergpredigt. Versuch einer zeitgenössischen Auslegung (BFchTh, 2nd ser. 7). 198 pp. 1923. — *Fiebig, P.*, Jesu Bergpredigt (FRLanT, n. s. 20). 152, 82 pp. 1924. — *Vogels, H. J.*, Synoptische Studien zur Bergpredigt (Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge i, 123-136). Düsseldorf, Schwann, 1924. — *Boehmer, Julius*, Hvem er de Fattige i Aanden? (DTT, V. 3, pp. 193-207). — *Von Harnack, Adolf*, Der ursprüngliche Text des Vaterunsers und seine älteste Geschichte (Erforschtes und Erlebtes, pp. 24-35). Giessen, Töpelmann, 1923. — *Brun, L.*, Der

Name und die Königsherrschaft im Vaterunser (Harnack-Ehrung, pp. 22-31). Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1921. — *Wimmerer, R.*, Noch einmal ἐπιούσιος (Glotta, xii, 1923, 68-82). — *Debrunner, A.*, 'Επιούσιος (Glotta, xiii, 1924, 167-171). — *Fridrichsen, A.*, "Ἀπὸς ἐπιούσιος (Symbolae Osloenses, fasc. ii, 31-42). Christiania, 1924. — *Sickenberger, J.*, Unser ausreichendes Brot gieb uns heute! 16 pp. Habelschwerdt, Franke, 1923.

In *Bornhäuser's* discussion of the Sermon on the Mount, the main idea is that it is addressed to the disciples, a kind of 'Teaching of the Twelve Apostles' made up of answers and rules originating in conversations, and that the aim of the whole, including the beatitudes, is to oppose the teaching of the Pharisees. Talmudic sources are used for illustrating the gospel sayings and suggesting novel interpretations. The scribes had said all that Jesus said; the difference was in the persons addressed. Matt. 5 is neither sentimental ethics nor 'interim-ethics'; but it is not ethics for everyone. In the Lord's Prayer ἐπιούσιος means 'for to-morrow,' as Eleazar understood it when he played upon the meaning (Mechilta, Ex. 16, 4). In Matt. 6, 25, μεριμνᾶν is not 'to take anxious thought' but 'to do toilsome work.' For the sake of their vocation, the apostles (to whom alone the saying is addressed) must be free from the need of earning their living and be independent of property, supported, it is assumed, by the church. With much that is suggestive, a good deal of the book is ill-considered or one-sided.⁶²

Fiebig gives rabbinical parallels for the Sermon on the Mount, in the original and in German translation, together with somewhat meagre explanatory notes and with variant readings. In some respects he provides what Strack and Billerbeck do not. — *Vogels* argues that Luke knew the Sermon on the Mount in the form which it bears in Matthew and that his Sermon on the Plain is an adaptation for gentile Christians. His evidence for the priority of Matthew and the dependence of Luke on Matthew is found especially in the closing parable, the beatitudes, and the sayings about returning good for evil. The woes *Vogels* takes to be inventions of Luke.

Boehmer takes πτωχὸς τῷ πνεύματι (Matt. 5, 3) as equivalent

⁶² See Dibelius, ThLZ, 1924, no. 16; Gressmann, ThBl, Nov. 1924.

to חָסִיד (cf. Prov. 6, 32; 7, 7, etc.), used like *νήπιος*, in contrast to the wise and prudent of this world. (Fr.)

Harnack's essay on the Lord's Prayer is a revision of two earlier studies which appeared in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy in 1904 and 1907. The original text of the prayer he would limit to the address "Father," and perhaps the first petition, together with the fourth, fifth, and sixth, since these are the portions common to Matthew and Luke. In Matthew the prayer has been much expanded, and Luke added one petition, that for the Holy Spirit. The original was a prayer for private use: Matthew has made it a church prayer, liturgically effective; Luke, a prayer of confession and initiation.

Brun explains the first and second petitions of the Lord's Prayer from the psalms for accession to the royal throne; their purport is the coming of the rule of God and homage to God as father and king; both petitions relate to the final consummation. The corresponding petitions of the kaddish-prayer are to be understood in the same way. *ἀγιασθήτω* is not to be interpreted according to Ezekiel 36, 23, nor referred to the divine act of judgment and salvation (Fridrichsen), but means the glorification of God by man, which will take place when God reveals his power.

Wimmerer derives *ἐπιούσιος* from *ἐπιούσα* (*ἡμέρα*) as referring to bread 'for the approaching, immediately present, and now-dawning, day,' as in Plato, *Crito* 44 A. It is a prayer for the eve of a festival. Or it may mean 'for the current day.' *ἐπιούσιος* may be a colloquial word or it may be an invention of the evangelists.

Debrunner again defends his derivation of *ἐπιούσιος*⁶³ as an invention of the koine (which liked to preserve the parts of words; cf. LXX, *γραμματοεισαγωγεύς*), signifying *ἐπὶ τὴν οὔσαν* (sc. *ἡμέραν*), 'destined for the day in question' (Matthew, 'to-day'; Luke, 'any day'). He rejects the meaning 'the current day' (Wimmerer) as lacking evidence, but admits the derivation from *ἐπιούσα* and even that from *οὐσία* (bread 'for the im-

⁶³ Compare Glotta, 1912, 249-252; *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, p. 75.

mediate needs of the body') as possible. The tautology, 'give us to-day the bread that we need to-day,' he does not find objectionable.

Fridrichsen derives the word ἐπιούσιος from ἐπιέναι, and makes it mean either 'for the morrow' or 'for the day now breaking.' The prayer is to be used in the evening or very early morning. The meaning 'for the morrow' can be given to τὸ καθ' ἡμέραν, but more probably Luke did not understand ἐπιούσιος and took it to mean ἐφήμερος. Among the earliest disciples prayer was offered before daybreak for sustenance for the approaching day; later, when the Lord's Prayer became a family prayer, ἐπιούσιος was applied to the product of 'to-day's' labor, asked for as a provision for the needs of 'to-morrow.' I would suggest here that no argument against the meaning 'bread for to-morrow' can be drawn from Matt. 6, 34, because (1) that precept does not belong in the context of the Lord's Prayer, and (2) under Oriental conditions the wage-earner must secure to-day his bread for to-morrow. — *Sickenberger* derives ἐπιούσιος from ἐπὶ οὐσίαν, regarding it as meaning 'sufficient' in contrast to περιούσιος, 'in abundance.'

b. Parables

Koch, C., Jesu Lignelser. 3rd edition. 396 pp. Copenhagen, Schönberg, 1923; Jesu Billedsprog. 180 pp. *ibid.* 1922. — *Riggenbach, E.*, Zwei Gleichnisse Jesu (Aus Schrift und Geschichte. Theologische Abhandlungen für A. Schlatter. Stuttgart, Calwer Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1922. pp. 17–34). — *Weiss, K.*, Voll Zuversicht! Zur Parabel vom zuversichtlichen Säemann Mk. 4, 26–29 (NA, x, 1). 76 pp. — *Van Rhijn, M.*, Een blik in het onderwijs van Jesus. Proeve eener nieuwe verklaring van der gelijkenis van den rijken man en den armen Lazarus (Lucas 16, 19–31). 164 pp. The Hague, Groningen, Wolters, 1924.

Riggenbach expounds the parables of the Unjust Steward (Lk. 16, 1–13) and of the Two Sons (Matt. 21, 28–32). Contrary to Kögel (BFChTh, xviii, 6, 1914), he understands the οἰκονόμος not as a tenant-farmer, but as an overseer. κύριος, vs. 8, means Jesus, and this verse begins the application of the parable. The adjunct τῆς ἀδικίας τοῦ μαμωνᾶς does not denote a moral stain, but in the sense of שָׁקֵר and שָׁקֵר refers to the treacherous, untrustworthy, deceptive aspect of Mammon. The

burden of the parable is provision for the future. In the second parable he accepts as original the text of B Θ minuscules, in which the first son says yes and the second no, with the corresponding reading in vs. 31a.

Contrary to the now usual explanation of the parable of the Seed Growing of Itself (Mk. 4, 26-29), which finds the *tertium comparationis* in αὐτομάτη, K. Weiss finds the point in the figure of the sower (Jesus). The 'sleeping and waking' symbolizes the happy confidence of the sower (and of the preacher Jesus). The harvest is the fulfilment of his hope. The explanation can hardly be accepted.⁶⁴

M. van Rhijn surveys the various explanations of the parable of Dives and Lazarus and attempts a new interpretation, into which he brings also the preceding parable of the Unjust Steward (Lk. 16). He emphasizes Jesus' purpose to arouse faith, and also his irony, and adduces talmudic illustrative material. The rich man represents pharisaism; Lazarus, a 'sinner,' one of the am-ha-ares. But the explanation is not very probable; see my article, NThT, 1925, pp. 343-360.

c. Other Sayings

Fridrichsen, A., Ordet om å bære sitt kors (Festskrift for Lyder Brun, 17-34). Christiania, Gröndahl, 1922. — Haering, Th., Matthäus 11, 28-30 (Aus Schrift und Geschichte, pp. 3-15). — Kattenbusch, F., Der Spruch über Petrus und die Kirche bei Matthäus (ThStKr, 1922, 96-131). — Goetz, K. G., Die rabbinische Vorlage von Matt. 16, 18 (ZNTW, 1921, 165-169). — Völter, D., Mattheüs 16, 18 (NThT, 1921, 124-205). — Euringer, S., Der locus classicus des Primates (Matt. 16, 18) und der Diatessarontext des heiligen Ephräm (Beiträge zur Geschichte des christlichen Altertums und der byzantinischen Literatur. Festgabe für A. Ehrhard, pp. 141-179). — Hoenen, P. H. J., De jongste aanval op Matt. 16, 18 (Studiën, Aug. 1921, 99-122). — Andrä, T., Skyddsängeln enligt Matt. 18, 10 (Festskrift for Stave, 321-330).

Fridrichsen examines the double tradition of the saying about bearing the cross (Matt. 10, 38; Lk. 14, 27; cf. Mk. 8, 34 and parallels) and comes to the conclusion that neither the negative (Q) nor the positive form (Mark) can be considered original. In any case the saying originally referred not to the martyr's death but to the loneliness and hatred that the dis-

⁶⁴ Compare Behm, ThLZ, 1923, no. 16/17; Sickenberger, BiblZ, 1924, 279.

ciples of Jesus must suffer. "The life of the disciple is like the march of a condemned criminal to the place of execution." In this sense, the saying may well have originated with Jesus. (Fr.)

Haering, professor of dogmatic theology at Tübingen, essays a new interpretation of Matt. 11, 28-30. The main idea of the saying is contained in *πραῖς*, which means, in correspondence with the Hebrew *'anav*, 'showing submission to the will of God.' This is what is meant by the 'yoke,' which he himself bears and which he offers to the weary and heavy-laden.

Kattenbusch discusses Harnack's interpretation of the saying about Peter and the rock in Matt. 16, 17 ff.⁶⁵ He considers the *σοῦ* to be original, but does not take the words as a promise that Peter shall not die (such an assumption he will not attribute to Jesus). Rather the words refer to Peter's confession of faith in Jesus. Kattenbusch thinks it probable that Jesus announced a purpose of gathering his followers, his 'people,' into an *ἐκκλησία*, and made Simon a sort of representative of his own person in the church during his absence from them. By 'the keys of the kingdom of heaven' are meant the Scriptures and the true understanding of them disclosed by Jesus. Peter is to be the leader in the reading and study of the Scriptures.

Goetz adduces a Jewish parallel to the metaphor of the Rock (Matt. 16, 18) in Jalkut Shimone on Num. 23, 9, I, p. 243 b., where God says of Abraham, "Lo, I have found a *petra* on which to build and to found the world." From this Goetz infers a rabbinical origin for the underlying idea of Matt. 16, 18, and ascribes the adoption of it to the evangelist.

Völter sees in John 1, 41 ff. the basis of Matt. 16, 17 ff., and considers everything beyond that in Matt. 16 as an addition with partisan purpose, partly imitated from Gal. 1, 15 f., partly from various passages in *Hermas*. He defends the canonical text against Harnack. — *Euringer* would refute Harnack's conjecture as to the text of Matt. 16, 18 by a thorough examination of the Diatessaron-scholia of Ephrem on the verse. Ephrem and Aphraates both testify that the saying about the building of the church stood in the Diatessaron.

⁶⁵ See HThR, 1922, 145.

The Roman Catholic *Hoenen* also opposes the view that Ephrem did not know the full text of Matt. 16, 18. In his commentary on Is. 57, 2, Ephrem quotes the saying about the church, and on Is. 54 he shows that he understood 'thou' to apply to the church.

Andrä upholds the view that the image of a heavenly counterpart of man is implied in Matt. 18, 10. He gives abundant evidence for such belief from other religions, especially primitive religions. (Fr.)

6. THE TEACHING OF JESUS

a. *Ethics of Jesus*

De Zwaan, J., De ethiek van Jezus. 25 pp. Utrecht, Ruys, 1923. — *Peisker, M.*, Troeltsch's Darstellung der Soziallehren des Evangeliums (Th-StKr, 1921, 1-54). — *Van der Merwe, J. M.*, Die sosiale prediking van Jesus Christus. Dissertation. 174 pp. Amsterdam, Bottenburg, 1921. — *Fiebig, P.*, War Jesus Rebell? 38 pp. Gotha, Perthes, 1920. — *Eisler, R.*, Jesus und die jüdischen Tieropfer (Vegetarische Werte, 1922, Hefte 8, 9, 10). — *Leipoldt, J.*, War Jesus Jude? 74 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1923; Jesus und die Frauen. 170 pp. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer, 1921.

The interesting study of the ethics of Jesus by *de Zwaan* is based on the distinction between the 'ethical' and the 'moral.' 'Ethics' means primary morality, resting on intuitive perception and moving in the sphere of the authority of conscience. 'Morals' means derived morality, set under external authority and embodied in rules. According to *de Zwaan*, Jesus knows only 'ethics' and appeals only to ethical intuition, never to the selfish desire for salvation, and he gives no 'rules,' but only revelations of duty (?). His ideal is the Kingdom of God, a community of sanctified personalities, purified for a higher existence and delivered from the tyranny of sin. In this sense *de Zwaan* interprets the two-fold rule of love. 'Interim-ethics' is to be found in Jesus' sayings, but the ordinary (Catholic and modern) explanations give no help. 'Interim-rules' are sayings which seldom apply to actual conduct, since they relate to situations that rarely occur (missionaries, prophets, martyrs). Two fundamental principles of the ethics of Jesus are belief in a transcendent world and the unity of personality. Jesus recog-

nized the rules of the Mosaic law, but he gave them an 'ethical' basis and regarded them as applications of his own ethics.⁶⁶

Peisker offers a corrective to Troeltsch's representation of the social teaching of Jesus. While Troeltsch held that Jesus required only the narrower circle of missionaries to renounce property and family for the sake of their mission, Peisker rejects this limitation; in his view the requirement of complete renunciation is an outcome of the absolute love of God and is for the sake of the souls of the disciples. However, the extreme requirement is not laid upon all, as it belongs to the practical, not the theoretical, ideal of discipleship; Jesus did not teach a double morality, but rather a variety of practical ways and means of living and practising the love of God. Peisker likewise attacks Troeltsch's opinion that it was for God's sake, not for man's, that Jesus called for personal service to others. The emphasis lies, rather, on self-denial in love to one's neighbor, on the sanctification of self, on manifesting the virtues of compassion, not on winning the soul of another through self-denying love nor on the spiritual improvement of an enemy. On the question of reception into the kingdom, Troeltsch emphasizes too little, or even ignores, the fact that repentance and the divine forgiveness in the gospel are the nerve of a right relation to God, and that faith in Jesus, attachment to him in faith, is the condition of salvation.

N. J. van der Merwe (South Africa), in his Amsterdam dissertation, discusses the social conditions in the environment of Jesus and, with this as background, the social teaching of Jesus. There was no proletariat in Palestine, but a great deal of poverty and exploitation of the poor. The differences were primarily religious, but religious ideals and religious controversy led to political and social conflicts. In the second part the author shows how subordinate in Jesus' mind was the ideal of a social deliverance; the main thought with him, as with the prophets, was the rule of God, mainly in an eschatological sense. The entire social teaching of Jesus is expressed in three

⁶⁶ See also de Zwaan, 'Het tijdelijke en het andere in onze kennis van Jezus' ethiek,' and 'Jezus' ethiek en het empirische christendom,' in *Onze Eeuw*, 1923, ii, 303-326; iii, 35-60.

words: fatherhood, sonship, brotherhood. In regard to the social relationships, marriage and family, master and servant, ruler and subject, he makes it plain that a mere bettering of economic conditions was condemned by Jesus. Jesus did not despise labor; nor was his attitude toward the Roman state revolutionary. The author's practical conclusion (expressed in his theses) is a moderate Christian socialism.

Fiebig's book is a reply to Kautsky's view (in his *Der Ursprung des Christentums*) that Jesus was a political rebel.⁶⁷ He examines in succession Kautsky's proofs of the proletarian and revolutionary character of Jesus and of primitive Christianity (proletarian solidarity, class hatred, communism, contempt for labor, abolition of the family, messianic aspirations, the messianic revolt of Jesus, etc.). In an appendix he deals with the theme, 'Jesus and labor,' especially Matt. 6, 25-36, with rabbinical parallels.

Kautsky's idea that Jesus undertook a messianic insurrection, in which he perished, is taken up in another form by *R. Eisler*. The purging of the temple furnished the occasion for Jesus' arrest and consequent death. Barabbas (Matt. 15, 7) and the two who were crucified with Jesus had taken part in the same *στάσις*. That the disciples were well armed is shown in Lk. 22, 36 ff., where the original statement must have been that each one, brandishing two swords, cried out, "See here! Two swords!" Also Matt. 10, 34 points to the expectation of a messianic war. Eisler further suggests that the purging of the temple was at the same time directed against the horror of bloody sacrifices, and from this point of view he describes the attitude of Jesus toward sacrificial worship (hence his otherwise somewhat bloody article was published in the *Vegetarische Warte*). One of his arguments is that the expression *σπήλαιον ληστών* meant originally (in Hebrew and so with Jesus) not 'den of robbers' but 'den of slaughterers.'⁶⁸

Leipoldt shows how far the question whether Jesus was a Jew can be historically answered. In the first place, it is prob-

⁶⁷ See on the other side H. Windisch, *Der messianische Krieg und das Urchristentum*, 1909.

⁶⁸ See Caldecott, *JThSt*, xxiv, 382 ff.; F. C. Burkitt, *ibid*, xxv, 386 ff.

able that Jesus was a son of David. He certainly spoke like a Jew. Decisive is the essential nature of his conception of God. The author contrasts the oriental and Jewish with the Greek conception of God; the former emphasizes the omnipotence and exaltation of God, and even when God is addressed as father, adds a certain sternness, surrounding God with ceremonial; the latter draws the gods more into the human sphere, emphasizes God's fatherly love and the bliss of communion with God. Jesus was undoubtedly on the side of the Jewish conception, but went beyond it, although just how is not made quite clear by the author. Even if Jesus shows points of contact also with the Greek idea of God, he is nevertheless not to be counted a Greek. The transcending of the Jewish idea is to be explained by his individual nature. He was Jewish in so far as he lived in the Old Testament.⁶⁹ — In his other book, "Jesus und die Frauen," *Leipoldt* discusses woman, marriage and celibacy, the customs of Jesus' time, and Jesus' own views. Jewish traditions are instructively brought into comparison, and there are abundant citations of sources and bibliography. *Leipoldt* has a large knowledge both of Jewish and of Greek and Roman literature.⁷⁰

b. *Jesus' Conception of Himself*

Mundle, W., Die Geschichtlichkeit des messianischen Bewusstseins Jesu (ZNTW, 1922, 291–311.) — *Reiss, A.*, Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu. 64 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921. — *Weidel, K.*, Jesu Persönlichkeit. Eine Characterstudie. 3rd edition. 128 pp. Halle, Marhold, 1921.

W. Mundle, answering Bultmann (ZNTW, 1920, 165 ff.), maintains that Jesus believed himself to be the Messiah. The 'secret of the Messiah' is the necessary counterpart of a belief in the resurrection, but that imposes no conclusion as to the origin of belief in the messiahship. The transfiguration is not an anticipated resurrection story. The disciples' faith in Jesus as Messiah is intelligible without the events of Easter. *Mundle*, further, challenges Bultmann's interpretation of Peter's confession as developed (with elimination of the miracle) from an

⁶⁹ See also Hänel, ThLBl, 1923, no. 25–26; K. L. Schmidt, ThBl, 1924, no. 4.

⁷⁰ See also Lohmeyer, DLZ, 1922, no. 25; E. von der Goltz, ThLZ, 1922, no. 2.

Easter narrative; as described in Mark the scene is thoroughly credible.

A. Reiss employs a peculiar philosophy of religion to account for the 'self-consciousness' of Jesus and its development in three phases (at his baptism, at the time of Peter's confession, and after the entry into Jerusalem). As sources he includes the farewell-discourses of the Gospel of John. The Paraclete is the risen Jesus. Reiss works out a theory of the resurrection appearances of Jesus.⁷¹

Weidel's fine character-study, which was thoroughly revised in the second edition (1913), is now re-issued with certain additions but substantially unchanged.

IV. THE JOHANNINE WRITINGS

1. THE AUTHOR

Riggenbach, E., Neue Materialien zur Beleuchtung des Papiaszeugnisses über den Märtyrertod des Johannes (NKZ, xxxiii, 692-696). — *Larfeld, W.*, Das Zeugnis des Papias über die beiden Johannes von Ephesus (NKZ, xxxiii, 490-512). — *Von Harnack, A.*, Das 'Wir' in den johanneischen Schriften (SAB, 1923, 96-113).

Riggenbach quotes the statements of the Byzantine exegetes Oecumenius, Theophylact, and Euthymius, and agrees with Zahn (see below, p. 71) that in the passage from Papias the apostle is confounded with the Baptist. — *Larfeld* again discusses the Papias extract from Eusebius, H. e. iii. 39 (see HThR, 1922, 157). According to this, Papias sought out the statements of the presbyters *with regard to* what Andrew and others had said. The *πρεσβύτεροι* are the church-elders or officers of the community. For *οἱ τοῦ κυρίου μαθηταί*, we should read *οἱ τοῦ Ἰωάννου μαθηταί*. Papias testifies to the composition of the gospel by the apostle John.

The question of the use of 'we' in the Johannine writings is of importance not only for the explanation of certain passages in the Epistles and John 1, 14, but also for the problem of the authorship of the Johannine literature. *Harnack* establishes that for most places in the Epistles it is the 'communica-

⁷¹ Compare Bultmann, ThLZ, 1922, 10.

tive plural'; 'we' means reader and writer, or the community of believers to which reader and author belong. But in some places 'we' is to be understood as an intensified 'I,' not 'communicative' but 'authoritative'; so 1 John 1, 1-5; 3 John 9 ff. Here the writer thinks of himself in a special sense as one who saw, heard, and announced the Word, but it does not follow that he was a disciple of Jesus during the latter's life-time. In the Gospel (3, 11; 9, 4), the author makes Christ use the intensified 'I.' In the prologue 1, 14 and 16, the evangelist speaks in the name of the community of all believers; likewise in 21, 24, *οἶδαμεν* is 'communicative' (Harnack assumes that the words *ὁ καὶ γράψας* here are an interpolation). The article concludes with a solution of the Johannine problem as a whole. The author of the Johannine writings was not, and does not claim to be, an eye-witness, but the son of Zebedee is the authority on whom he relies. The author is the Presbyter John of Ephesus, and his identification with the beloved disciple is the work of the interpolator in John 21, 24 (*ὁ καὶ γράψας ταῦτα*). Behm, in ThLZ, 1924, no. 12, rejects this 'authoritative' plural, admitting only the 'authorial' and the 'communicative' plurals. In 1 John 1, 1 ff. and John 1, 14, 'we' designates the apostle as personal witness to the Word become flesh.

2. THE FOURTH GOSPEL

a

Schat-Petersen, L. W., Johannes' evangelium fortolket. 2nd edition revised by F. Torm. 678 pp. Copenhagen, Hagerup, 1923. — *Von Harnack, A.*, Zum Johannesevangelium (Erforschtes und Erlebtes, 36-43). — *Faure, A.*, Die alttestamentlichen Zitate im vierten Evangelium und die Quellscheidungshypothese (ZNTW, 1922, 99-121). — *Knudsin, K.*, Eine wenig beachtete Ueberlieferungsschicht im vierten Evangelium (ZNTW, 1923, 80-91). — *Windisch, H.*, Der johanneische Erzählungsstil (Eucharisterion, II, 174-214).

Harnack's essay is a supplement to his translation of the Gospel and Epistles of John which appeared in the Inselbücherei (Leipzig) no. 251. John's general purpose leads him to introduce the concrete material of historical narrative only for the sake of transcending it; his absorbing concern with the higher reality is what entitled him to mingle as he does the his-

torical and the fictitious. The themes of his discourses come in part from Jesus Christ himself. The author is a Palestinian Christian who removed to Asia Minor and had the apostle John as his authority. Friends published the book, which had been left uncompleted; thus Harnack points out that one speech is missing from the story of the miracle at Cana (chap. 2), which is unintelligible without it, while in all other cases significant events are accompanied by words of explanation.

On the analysis of sources in John, we may take up first an article by *Faure*. His hypothesis is that chaps. 1 to 12 rest on a collection of *σημεία* which ended with 20, 30 f. and was composed in order to establish Jesus' messiahship by his 'signs,' perhaps against Jewish objections raised by the disciples of John.⁷² In chaps. 1-12, 16 the references to the Old Testament are simply quotations and allusions; thereafter through chap. 19 they are introduced by *ἵνα πληρωθῇ* or a similar phrase. From the redactor come the elements inconsistent with the miracle-motive. In confirmation Faure points out the incomplete connection of narration and reflection, the disorder in the composition and in the connection of chapters, the repetitions and doublets, notwithstanding that the whole makes the impression of careful planning. The final redactor, an uninstructed and dogmatically prejudiced person, received the work as an uncompleted sketch, which he rearranged, or rather disarranged, and provided with eschatological and other additions. All this would explain the medley of mysticism and history, tradition and composition, Judaism and Hellenism.

Besides the two heterogeneous elements recognized by Faure, *Knudsin*, of Riga, would add as a third element the reflection of the earliest history of Christianity. In chap. 4 the later Samaritan mission is described; the evangelist combines the success of the earthly and of the risen Jesus. In 3, 22-4, 2 we have the beginnings of baptism, with mention of the adoption of the rite from John by the earliest disciples. Other instances are the first gathering of disciples, 1, 35 ff. (Bethsaida was the seat of reconstruction after the catastrophe); Cana as the place

⁷² Thompson, *Expositor*, ser. 8, vols. x, xi.

of the greatest successes, with the temporary obscuring of Capernaum; the mother and brothers of Jesus and their active part in the earliest formation of a church in Galilee; then the transference of the centre of activity to Jerusalem (cf. R. Schütz, below, p. 99). As an explanation of the Gospel of John the hypothesis seems to possess probability only for 3, 22-4, 2 and 4, 3 ff.

A beginning has been made in applying the 'formgeschichtliche Methode' to John, the first attempt being made by *H. Windisch*. In respect to form, as in other matters, John stands in marked contrast to the Synoptic Gospels. In the latter, a mosaic of pericopes; in John, a dramatic and relatively compact narrative, consisting of a small number of fully detailed, dramatically presented miracle-stories, of which polemic discourses often form an integral part; further, combination of related single scenes (1, 19 ff.), a few single pericopes (als though these are exceptional and are articulated into the general scheme); the great speeches and polemic discourses, occasionally showing dramatic traits; the farewell discourses; the passion-narrative, possessing much more unity and compactness than that of the Synoptic Gospels; finally the resurrection-narrative, the only section which exhibits the pericope system. The distinctive feature of John is its dramatic structure. What J. M. Thompson has pointed out for chaps. 9 and 18 (*Expositor*, ser. 8, vol. xvi) I find in chaps. 4, 11, and 1; namely, the readiness with which the narrative in John takes on dramatic form. The study leads finally to the paradox that the same gospel which created the new type of Christ, a being of the spirit, super-mundane, is almost everywhere in its narrative more concrete, more dramatic, more 'novellistic,' more literary, than the popular tradition of the Synoptics. In any case, John is far more a work of 'literature' than the Synoptics, and its author a much more original and artistic narrator. It remains to be considered (the point is not treated in my article) whether the riddle may not be solved by the hypothesis of a narrative source in dramatic form. Yet the evangelist (author of the speeches and prologue) must be deemed the real author of the

work, to whom are due the consistency of form observable in the whole book and its dramatic structure as a whole.⁷³

b

Grill, J., Untersuchungen über die Entstehung des vierten Evangeliums. Part II: Das Mysterienevangelium des hellenisierten kleinasiatischen Christentums. 443 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1923. — *Bert, G.*, Das Evangelium des Johannes. 144 pp. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1922. — *Odland, S.*, Johannesevangeliets egthet. 142 pp. Christiania, Lutherstiftelsen, 1923.

Studies of John from the point of view of the history of religion are more numerous. After many years *J. Grill* has continued and completed his study of the theological character and position of the Gospel of John. Having in Part I treated chiefly the influence of the Philonic logos-theology on John's representation of Christ, he now covers this "underpainting" with parallel mythical types from Grecian antiquity. Above all, the parallelism of Dionysus and Christ is made to explain many features. Surpassing Dionysus, Christ is portrayed in John as bringer of joy to mankind, as dispenser of the water of life and the personified Vine, as wonder-working wedding guest, and as bridegroom (2, 1 ff. is certainly the clearest epiphany of a divine-human being akin to Dionysus), as zealous advocate, who even appears as a madman (the cleansing of the temple), as seer, as physician, as deliverer, purifier, and saviour, as shepherd, as victor over death, as founder of a sacrament which offers flesh and blood, etc. Motives from the myths of Asclepius also appear, and in John 11 a combination of the myths, derived from Nearer Asia and from Indo-Persian sources by way of Asia Minor, of the vernal new moon and the morning and evening crimson which precedes it, — here the author quite loses himself in mythological speculation such as Robertson and A. Drews are so fond of.

John first introduces a real 'mystery' in chap. 6, and Grill takes occasion to give a very interesting survey of the influence of the Mysteries on the Christian sacraments. He limits this to various Pauline ideas and to the Gospel of John. The word *μυστήριον* in the New Testament has nothing to do with the

⁷³ See on this point, and on all the contributions to Eucharisterion, W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1924, no. 10; Bertram, ThBl, Feb. 1924.

'mysteries.' In the doctrine of the Spirit and in the baptism of John Old Testament influence is predominant; and that has nothing in common with mysticism or mysteries. The Last Supper was originally a messianic, farewell passover-meal; was then in the Epistle to the Hebrews typologically associated with the meal of Melchizedek, and was first made into a sacrament in John, through the type of the mystical meal in the worship of Dionysus. The legend of John created the figure of the ideal apostle John, who then became a 'witness' for this hellenizing (Logos-Dionysus) of the gospel. The book strongly recalls the method and views of H. Holtzmann, to whose memory Vol. II is dedicated. It takes no notice of Burney's and Torrey's attempts to bring John back to Palestine. Oriental influences are given a place only in minor points, notably when the author represents the 'Parseeism' which he finds in Matthew (particularly in the Lord's Prayer) as a step toward the universalistic Hellenism of John. That represents a sort of orientalizing of the New Testament and especially of John, such as R. Reitzenstein attempts on the basis of Mandaean documents.⁷⁴

'Hellenistic-oriental' is thus the name for the latest phase of the study of John. *G. Bert* is almost wholly under the spell of the Hellenic logos-idea and its influence on John. The Gospel of John is the fulfilment of the logos-idea of Greek philosophy. In the spirit of Philo, John depicts the inner spiritual experiences of life in the form of external events. Nevertheless, Bert makes much of the Oriental element also, discussing anew the relation first noticed by Harnack between John and the Odes of Solomon, where the same conception of salvation, and especially the logos-idea, is used, so that the same land of origin (according to Bert, Asia Minor) must be assumed for both. This conception of the gospel as an allegorical and dramatic representation of the life and work of Jesus seems to Bert to confirm its apostolic origin. Only if the Fourth Gospel claimed to be 'history' in the same sense as the Synoptic tradition, would an intolerable contradiction be present. He seeks to show also that the special spiritual qualities of the fourth evangelist, his inner independence, his spiritual and vital wealth, his mysti-

⁷⁴ Compare also C. Clemen, *ThLZ*, 1923, no. 15.

cism, his enthusiasm, can be found in the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels too, so that the author must have been a disciple very near to Jesus. John understood Jesus better than the later church, in which ecstasy and enthusiasm were less and less prominent. But Bert fails to see that these kindred ideas which he traces are to be understood in an eschatological sense in the Synoptics and with Jesus, but in a mystical sense in John, so that there is no close spiritual kinship.⁷⁵

c

Bultmann, R., Der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund des Prologs zum Johannes-evangelium (Eucharisterion, I, 3-26). — *Seeberg, R.*, 'Ο λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο (Festgabe für Harnack, 263-281). — *Schmidt, K. L.*, Der johanneische Charakter der Erzählung vom Hochzeitswunder in Kana (Harnack-Ehrung, 32-43). — *Schulz, A.*, Das Wunder zu Kana im Lichte des Alten Testaments (BiblZ, xvi, 93-96). — *Philips, Th.*, Die Verheissung der heiligen Eucharistie nach Johannes. Eine exegetische Studie. Bonn dissertation. viii, 205 pp. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1922. — *Meyer, Eduard*, Sinn und Tendenz der Schlusszene am Kreuz im Johannes-evangelium (SAB, philol.-hist. Klasse, 1924, 157-162).

Bultmann is the first to call attention to the orientalizing motive which will determine the direction of future study of John. His work on the prologue recalls the study of Rendel Harris. Its basis is a hymn to Wisdom. The transformation of Wisdom into the Logos is a product of Alexandrian-Jewish speculation, although not directly attributable to Philo. In the prologue, as in the Jewish wisdom-literature, we meet the antinomy that the Logos is both the immanent power of knowing and the bearer of revelation. Analogies from the history of religion point to Babylonian mythology and the Mandaean speculations of Enoch, the messenger of God. Bultmann closes with the interesting conjecture that the earliest form of the prologue may belong to the sect of John the Baptist, which honored the Baptist as the one in whom the Logos became flesh,⁷⁶ while in the Christian additions, vss. 6-8 and 15, John

⁷⁵ See also Strathmann, ThGg, 1923, 251 f.; Th. Zahn, Offenbarung des Johannes I, 100; Mundle, ThBl, 1923, no. 2; Bultmann, ThLZ, 1923, no. 8.

⁷⁶ This hypothesis has apparently already been considered by Bruston, 'De quelques textes relatifs à Jean-Baptiste et non à Jésus-Christ,' Revue de théologie, Montauban, 1911.

is reduced to the rank of a 'witness.' Or possibly a source was followed for vss. 1-13, and with vs. 14 the evangelist's own composition begins. In any case, the resemblance of the prologue and of the whole gospel to Mandaean-Iranian speculation must be emphasized; for this Bultmann calls special attention to the Johannine doctrine of the Son of Man.

R. Seeberg brings John 1, 14 (ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο) into relation to the baptism and the descent of the Spirit, assuming the reading 'who was born,' with the singular, in vs. 13. Then vs. 13 refers to Jesus' birth, and vss. 14b-c and 15 to his public appearance after the baptism; hence vs. 14 must be a reference to the bestowal upon him of the Holy Spirit (the Logos). Both statements, those of vss. 13 and 14, are directed against Cerinthus.⁷⁷ Seeberg thinks that this (very questionable) explanation gives a new point of harmony between John and the Synoptics.

K. L. Schmidt discusses the difficulty mentioned above, that the miracle of Cana is a popular 'nouvelle,' little suited to the general scheme of the gospel of the Logos, yet is organically related to the other Johannine miracles. All these centre about a benefit which Jesus confers and at the same time himself is. In the story of the marriage at Cana, the point is the transformation, and the element is water-wine, so that here too we are in the realm of religious identifications. A piece of pure folklore has been raised by additions and subtractions to the level of allegory. Schmidt points out analogies in the Philonic logos and in the mysteries of Dionysus.

A. Schulz points out that, as Jesus at Cana, so the Old Testament prophets often make previous preparation for their miracles. See 1 Kings 17, 13 ff.; 18, 34 ff.; 2 Kings 2, 20; 4, 38 ff. Mary, however, expected the miracle of the wine, because she thought of the messianic prophecies in Gen. 49, 11; Amos 9, 13; Joel 4, 18. Her mistake lay in thinking that the Golden Age was already dawning.

Philips offers an exegesis (often unconventional) of John 6, 26-71. The gospel has anti-gnostic purpose and rests on Pauline doctrine. The author's 'hierarchical' discourses show

⁷⁷ Compare also vs. 32, καὶ ἔμεινεν.

him to have been a presbyter, accustomed to lead in liturgical worship.⁷⁸

Eduard Meyer explains the words from the cross addressed to mother and disciple as the 'adoption' of the beloved disciple by Jesus, who designates John as heir, bearer, and witness of the true tradition. The scene is one step in the process of falsification which produced the Johannine legend.

3. THE EPISTLES OF JOHN

Wendt, H. H., Zum ersten Johannesbrief (ZNTW, 1923, 57-79); Zum zweiten und dritten Johannesbrief (ZNTW, 1924, 18-27). — *Nagl, E.*, Die Gliederung des ersten Johannesbriefes (BiblZ, xvi, 77-92).

Wendt's first article discusses the ethical controversy in the first Epistle of John, and its conception of Christ as compared with that of Paul. — In his second article he describes 1 John as not a religious diatribe but intended for a particular church, that, namely, which is addressed in the second and implied in the third epistle. 2 John preceded 1 John, and is referred to in 1 John 2, 12-14. The purpose of 2 John is to prevent the wavering from yielding to Christian gnostic reformers, whose coming the writer anticipates. 3 John shows that 2 John did not find immediate acceptance, but 1 John 2, 12 ff. shows that the gnostic party was not victorious in the end.^{78a}

Nagl follows the usual division of 1 John as follows: I (1, 5-2, 28), 'God is light'; II (2, 29-4, 6), 'God is just'; III (4, 7-5, 19), 'God is love.' Each of these sections he divides again into three parts, the second part in each case referring to opposition to the *κόσμος*, the third part to opposition to false doctrine.

4. THE APOCALYPSE

Zahn, Th., Die Offenbarung des Johannes. Erste Hälfte, Kap. 1-5 mit ausführlicher Einleitung. 1st, 2nd, and 3rd editions. 346 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1924. — *Weber, H. E.*, Zum Verständnis der Offenbarung Johannis (Aus Schrift und Geschichte, pp. 47-64). — *Sattler, W.*, Das Buch mit sieben Siegeln. i, ii (ZNTW, 1921, 231-240; 1922, 43-52). — *Brückner, Wilhelm*, Die grosse und die kleine Buchrolle in der Offenbarung

⁷⁸ See also Sickenberger, BiblZ, 1924, 287.

^{78a} See also Wendt, Die Johannesbriefe und das johanneische Christentum, Halle, Waisenhaus, 1925.

Johannis Kap. 5 und Kap. 10. 22 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1923. — *Von Harnack, A.*, Die apokalyptischen Reiter (Erforschtes und Erlebtes, 53–64). — *Zondervan, P.*, De verborgene zin van Offenbarung 17, 9–11 (NThT, 1922, 325–337). — *Sickenberger, J.*, Das tausendjährige Reich in der Apokalypse (Festschrift für Sebastian Merkle, 300–316). Düsseldorf, Schwann, 1922.

The most important work on the Apocalypse that has appeared is the first volume of *Zahn's* commentary. The full introduction treats of the tradition of the ancient church with special reference to Irenaeus; the internal evidence of the book itself; and 'negative criticism,' including the Alogoi and Dionysius of Alexandria, as well as modern critics; and gives an important detailed criticism of the hypothesis of John's early death as a martyr. The bibliography is not complete for recent works. Brief notes of textual criticism are added. *Zahn's* interpretation is extraordinarily instructive, though many of his special views were already known from his Introduction to the New Testament. At the outset he combats the opinion that the Book of Revelation belongs in a class of apocalypses; on the contrary, John is the creator of the type, and the so-called (Syriac) Apocalypse of Baruch is a Christian pseudograph (a view which he rests chiefly on Apoc. Baruch, c. 30). For the difficult χαλκολίβανος, 1, 15, he conjectures the meaning 'pot' or 'kettle.' The 'angels' of the churches are the episcopal representatives of the church, as Vitranga demonstrated. The seven letters are accordingly taken literally as personal communications to the bishops, whose personal merits and defects, as well as their domestic relations, are revealed by the letters. The letter to Smyrna is addressed to Polycarp, and the prophecy therein contained was literally fulfilled in the martyrdom of Polycarp. The throne of Satan at Pergamon is for the worship of Asclepius, not of the emperor. Jezebel (2, 20) is the wife of the bishop of Thyatira (*Zahn* reads σου). With chap. 4 begins a second vision; John used the interval between the two visions to write down what he had so far seen and heard. The book with seven seals is a last will and testament. We can only hope that the venerable Nestor of New Testament learning may be permitted to complete his exposition of the Apocalypse.

Weber, professor at Bonn, protests against the view that the Apocalypse is a literary fiction, and uses modern religious psychology to explain the pictures of the Apocalypse as actual visions. The unity of the book is proved, he thinks, by the correct interpretation of chap. 10. Here a pause is noted, because before the final struggle is described a two-fold glance backward must be given, in chap. 11 and chap. 12.

Sattler, in his first article, deals with the prayer of the martyrs and the granting of the prayer. The abiding place 'under the altar' refers to the altar in the Milky Way, the abiding-place of souls, according to Pythagorean philosophy. With 6, 9, compare 20, 4 and 19, 9. The last passage is the symbolic fulfilment of the promise; the ultimate fulfilment is the dawning of the millennium. The second article discusses the Book of Works and the Book of Life. The seven letters are dictated out of the Book of Works, in which the deeds of men are recorded. With the Book of Life Sattler would identify the Book of the Seven Seals, but his explanation of it as the book of fate or book of the future is certainly to be rejected, for its contents do not relate to the events which follow. In form the sealed book is a last will and testament (J. Weiss, Zahn); accordingly, as the book of life, it is the testament of God. The day of the judgment is thus the day of the execution of the will.

Wilhelm Brückner, another veteran of New Testament study, proposes an analysis of sources. He distinguishes 4, 1-22, 5 as a Jewish 'Grundschrift' slightly worked over by a Christian; its most noteworthy characteristic is that it contains no reference to the second coming of Jesus Christ. The Jewish writing itself consists of two Jewish apocalypses, the great roll and the small roll. The former contains the answer to the question of the martyrs, 6, 9 ff.; and comprises five parts: 8, 2-9, 21 and 11, 15-19; 14, 14-20; 15-16; 17; 19, 11-16. The small roll includes 10; 11, 1-13; 12, 1-9; 13, 1-7; and 13, 11-18. For it the use of the number three-and-one-half is characteristic. It belongs to the time of Caligula, who reigned forty-six months; chap. 13, 1-7 relates to this emperor's attack on the temple, and the number 616 clearly indicates Caligula. A Christian redactor combined the two rolls and made Christian addi-

tions. In this way the Lamb, which originally denoted the suffering Jewish people, became Jesus Christ. Chap. 18 is a separate fragment inserted unchanged by the redactor, who lived under Domitian and produced 4, 1-22, 5. Chaps. 1-3 were composed in the time of Trajan, quite independently of chaps. 4-22. Chaps. 1, 1-3 and 22, 6-20 are the work of a final redactor, who combined the letters with the redactor's apocalypse. The hypothesis is simple and self-consistent, and deserves the attention of critics.⁷⁹

In his essay on the Horsemen of the Apocalypse, which appeared first in the *Festschrift der Kaiser-Wilhelmgesellschaft* (Berlin, 1921), *Harnack* assigns this episode to the Jewish apocalypse, and holds it to rest on Zechariah. He rejects Boll's derivation from the four signs of the zodiac, as they do not suit the descriptions of the four horsemen except in the case of the third, where the account of the famine can be explained by a calendar-adage relating to Libra. He thus abandons his former chronological explanation suggested by the observation of Reinach.

P. Zondervan looks to astrology for the hidden meaning of Rev. 17, 9-11. As in Enoch 18, 6 ff. mountains and stars belong together, so here the seven kings are the seven planets. The beast with seven heads and ten horns was originally an image of the starry heavens, but it symbolizes Rome, and, so far as it disappears and re-appears, Nero.

According to *Sickenberger*, the reign of a thousand years is a period in which Satan's direct attacks will be suspended, while the place where the martyrs enjoy their blessed reward and rule with Christ will be heaven.

V. THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

Wikenhauser, A., Die Apostelgeschichte und ihr Geschichtswert (NA, viii, 3-5). xviii, 440 pp. 1921. — *Zahn, Th.*, Die Apostelgeschichte des Lucas. Zweite Hälfte Kap. 13-28. pp. 395-884. 1st and 2nd editions. Leipzig, Deichert, 1921. — *Dibelius, M.*, Stilkritisches zur Apostelgeschichte (Eucharistion, II, 27-49). — *Van den Bergh van Eysinga, G. A.*, Doubletten in Handelingen (NThT, 1921, 276-300); Jets over Bronnenscheiding in de Handelingen der Apostelen (*ibid.* 1924, 274-298). — *Wetter, G. P.*, Das

⁷⁹ See Dibelius, ThLZ, 1924, no. 9, and Weinl's preface to the book.

älteste hellenistische Christentum nach der Apostelgeschichte (AR, xxi, 1922, 397-429). — *Mundle, W.*, Die Stephanusrede Acta 7: eine Märtyrerapologie (ZNTW, 1921, 133-147). — *Eidem, E.*, Ett sammansatt citat i Apostlagärningarna (Festschrift for Pfannestill, 13-20). Lund, 1923. — *Corssen, P.*, Das Verhältnis der Apostelgeschichte zum 3. Evangelium (Neue Jahrb. f. d. klass. Alt., 1922, 426-439).

Wikenhauser's book is a serviceable résumé of the historical criticism of Acts by a Roman Catholic scholar. All the historical problems are discussed at length, with full bibliography and textual criticism. The author holds that Acts was in some degree intended to assist in the defence of Paul at his trial, and therefore was written during the "two years" of Acts 28, 30. Its literary type (*πράξεις*) is well illustrated from similar works. The chapter on the altar of the unknown god contains full quotation of the authorities.⁸⁰

The second half of *Zahn's* learned commentary is another notable achievement of exegesis. With regard to the chronology implied in Acts 20, 5 ff., he shows that the 16th of Nisan in the year in question fell on a Tuesday. The author briefly defends further his belief in two recensions of the book. The additions in Edition A (Codex Bezae, etc.) are not glosses nor interpolations, since they contain no anachronisms and no self-contradictions. Edition A does not contradict Edition B, but many places in B are corrections or abridgments of A. Two only of the excursus originally planned are here printed: viz. V. Chronology; VIII. The Inscription at Athens. As to the former topic, the following dates are known: A.D. 30, the death of Jesus; 44, the journey of Acts 11, 30-12, 25; autumn of 51 to spring of 53, Paul in Corinth; 57, Easter in Philippi.⁸¹

Dibelius carries on into Acts the critical study of style. In contrast to the author of the Gospel of Luke, the author of Acts paid much attention to style, and his work is much more 'literary' than the gospels. It is a book of legend, tradition, biography. The middle part is based on an itinerary; the last part is a literary invention, with epideictic discourses and a deliberate imitation of other accounts of sea-voyages. In the first part the work of the author is seen, especially in the brief

⁸⁰ See also W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1923, no. 4.

⁸¹ See Dibelius, ThLZ, 1922, no. 21.

summaries. Dibelius analyzes several of the legendary narratives. The raising of Eutychus is noticeable for its lack of sacred association and is perhaps an anecdote from some outside source transferred to Paul. The account of the death of Herod is based on a Jewish legend, here less changed as to form than in Josephus.

Doublets in Acts were recognized by the Tübingen school, and now *van den Bergh van Eysinga* would show that they occur also *within* the stories of Peter and of Paul, as in 2, 42-44 and 4, 32-37, and the related passages, as already pointed out by Harnack. Van Eysinga opposes Harnack's favorable opinion of Source A, saying that this too is legendary, and not a 'source' in the proper sense, and betrays Luke's fondness for repeating himself. Chap. 4, 31 ff. is not the original account but a brief recapitulation of 2, 1-13. Similar repetitions are to be found in the missionary discourses (chaps. 2, 3, 10, 13), the three accounts of the conversion of Paul, the two journeys to Jerusalem (chaps. 11 and 15), the reference to the Apostolic Decree in 21, 25, the two references to Paul's Roman citizenship, and in other places. These repetitions show how few historical facts the author had at his disposal and how little claim his book has to be history. — The same writer's second article, on the analysis of sources in Acts, is more important and more convincing. He rejects the principle that contradictions, imperfect connections, and inaccuracies are signs of the combination of different sources, and gives examples from Acts 1-16 to show that this inconsistency can be explained by Luke's habit of freely refashioning and even inventing his narratives. If he used sources, we cannot identify them. The article points out many difficulties in the composition of Acts, but is not wholly satisfactory to those who regard the book as containing history and not merely legend.

Wetter thinks he can show a hellenistic source in Acts, used in the stories of Pentecost and of Cornelius. In the pentecost-narrative the redactor, who had in his source both the miracle and the quotation from Joel, composed Peter's sermon, addressed to Jews of the Diaspora, and to him is due the introduction of the apostles into the affair. The original form of the

story came from the gentile Christians living in Jerusalem (the 'Hellenists'). The speech of Stephen was originally an encomium but has been transformed into anti-jewish propaganda. The Cornelius episode dealt with the problem of community of meals between Jews and gentiles, and comes from the same hellenistic circle. Wetter often, but not completely, follows Loisy.

Mundle's work on Acts 7 well supplements that of Di-belius. He illustrates the account of Stephen's trial and martyrdom by later analogies. The earlier part of the speech is designed to justify the Christians' belief that they belong to another world. Its polemic is not pre-pauline but is the work of the final author of the book and reflects the debate between Christians and Jews.

Eidem discusses composite quotations in Acts, especially 13, 22. A comparison with 1 Clem. 18, 1 (which shows both resemblances and divergencies) suggests the use of a messianic florilegium or catena. (Fr.) — *Corssen* holds that Acts was written before the Gospel of Luke, and that Marcion's recension of Luke is the 'Ur-Lucas.'

VI. PAUL AND HIS EPISTLES

1. LIFE OF PAUL

II

Schneller, L., Paulus. Das Leben des Apostels. 426 pp. Leipzig, Wallmann, 1923. — *Vischer, E.*, Der Apostel Paulus und sein Werk (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 30). 2nd edition. 141 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1921. — *Moe, O.*, Apostelen Paulus. Hans liv og gjerning. 488 pp. Christiania, Aschehoug, 1923.

b

Weber, V., Galatèr 2 und Apostelgeschichte 15 in neuer Beleuchtung. 36 pp. Würzburg, Becker, 1923. — *Liechtenhan, R.*, Die beiden ersten Besuche des Paulus in Jerusalem (Harnack-Ehrung, 51-67). — *Larfeld, W.*, Die delphische Gallio-inschrift und die paulinische Chronologie (NKZ, 1923, 638-647). — *Golla, E.*, Zwischenreise und Zwischenbrief (BiblSt, xx, 4). 110 pp. 1922. — *Tom, W.*, Heeft Paulus to Efeze gevangen gezeten? (Gereformeerd theologisch Tijdschrift, xxiv, 1924, 450-460, 500-513). — *Veldhoen, N. G.*, Het proces van den apostel Paulus. Leyden dissertation in Faculty of Law. 133 pp. Alphen a. d. Rijn, 1924.

c

Gerhardt, O., In welchem Jahre wurde der Apostel Paulus in Jerusalem gefangen gesetzt? (NKZ, xxxiii, 89-116). — *Hadorn, W.*, Die Gefährten und Mitarbeiter des Paulus (Aus Schrift und Geschichte, 65-82).

a

Schneller's book is a continuation of his earlier work, "In alle Welt." — *Vischer's* little book on Paul, which departs in many respects from the views of modern critics, is not substantially changed from the first edition (1909). — *Moe's* life of Paul is strictly conservative in its attitude toward Acts; his method is that of the harmonizer.

b

V. Weber again defends the South-Galatian theory and the early date of Galatians, and argues against identifying the events of Gal. 2 and Acts 15. The order of events was as follows: beginning of the collection for Jerusalem; journey of Gal. 2 with agreement about the contributions; delivery of the money contributed (Acts 11, 30 and Gal. 2 are two separate journeys); missionary journey to South Galatia (Acts 13 ff.); the incident at Antioch (Gal. 2, 11 ff.); arrival of Judaizers at Antioch and in South Galatia; the Epistle to the Galatians; finally the council of Acts 15.

Liechtenhan investigates the connection of Gal. 1 and Acts 9. The second journey to Jerusalem (Gal. 2, 1 ff.) is the same as that of Acts 11, 28 ff. Acts 15 does not relate to a third journey but is a parallel account to Acts 11, Luke having made two events out of two accounts of the same event. *Liechtenhan* distinguishes two strata in *Harnack's* Antiochian source of Acts, one limited to bare facts, the other more 'novellistic.' The former slurred over the real character of the journey because the scars that it had left were not yet healed; in the second the story was somewhat altered.

Larfeld, discussing the Gallio inscription, fixes Gallio's term of office as the year 51-52. Since Luke usually gives first a summary account and then narrates the separate episodes, the scene before Gallio did not take place at the end of the 'year

and a half,' but in the middle of it, and the charges against Paul were probably brought at the beginning of Gallio's term of office. Paul left Corinth in the spring; hence the stay in Corinth lasted from the autumn of 51 to the spring of 53.

Golla rejects all the recent hypotheses about 2 Cor. (the four chapters, the intermediate visit, and the intermediate letter). 2 Cor. 12, 14 and 13, 1 relate only to an occasion for coming, and do not prove an actual journey. The incident of 2 Cor. 2 and 7 is the case of incest of 1 Cor. 5.

Tom argues for the conjectured Ephesian imprisonment of Paul and for the assignment of Philippians to that time. Evidence for the imprisonment is 1 Cor. 15, 32 and 16, 9, and 2 Cor. 1, 8 f. and 11, 26. The 'fighting with beasts' in 1 Cor. 15, 32 is meant literally but the conditional sentence is 'contrary to fact.' Paul was arrested and condemned to fight with beasts, but was freed by claiming his rights as a Roman citizen. The references in Philippians seem to fit Ephesus better than they do Rome and Acts 28.

Veldhoen, Reformed pastor, in his dissertation for the doctorate in law, comes to the conclusion that in Luke's account of the trial of Paul (Acts 22 ff.) we have a real piece of juristic procedure in the imperial age. But his meritorious investigation does not solve all the difficulties, and does not take into account A. Loisy's drastic criticism. The action of Claudius Lysias (Acts 22, 30) in assembling the Sanhedrim and bringing Paul before it is not fully explained. To the current interpretations of *diētia* in Acts 24, 27, he adds a new one: namely, that, as can be inferred from Dio Cassius lx. 33, the emperor could renew the term of office of a governor for two years at a time, and that at the date in question such a *diētia* had expired without the renewal of the appointment. It is doubtful whether the words can refer to this custom. With regard to the appeal to the emperor, Veldhoen thinks that in capital cases against Roman citizens a governor could not 'acquit,' but was obliged either to 'release' or to 'submit' the question to the emperor. Finally he tries to explain Acts 28, 30 f. If a Latin papyrus (Berlin Gr. Urk. 628) relates to an edict of Nero (provision for the case that the accused, the accuser, or both parties fail to

appear), then Paul was released because of the non-appearance of the Jews.

c

Gerhardt believes it possible to fix the year of Paul's arrest by astronomical calculation, using the statements as to the days of the week in Acts 20, 6 ff. Paul celebrated the Pass-over at Philippi on Tuesday, March 28, A.D. 58, and was arrested in the same year. — *Hadorn* characterizes the companions and fellow-workers mentioned in Paul's Epistles, and describes their relation to the apostle.

2. GENUINENESS OF THE EPISTLES

Weber, V., Grundsäulen der Kritik des Neuen Testaments? Die Rätselfragen des radikalen Kritikers G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga beantwortet. 45 pp. Würzburg, Becker, 1922. — *Van den Bergh van Eysinga, G. A.*, Pro domo. Opgedragen aan Prof. Dr. R. Steck in Bern (NThT, 1923, 186–210). — *Lehmann, E.*, and *Fridrichsen, A.*, 1 Cor. 13. Eine christlich-stoische Diatribe (ThStKr, 1922, 55–95). — *Lundberg, J.*, Till frågan om Kolosserbrevets ursprung (Festskrift for Stave, 263–269).

Weber (Roman Catholic) discusses with skill the theses of van Eysinga (Die holländische Radikal-kritik des Neuen Testaments, 180 ff.), and tries to answer them. He then lays down the principles of method and tries to establish 'foundation pillars' for a positive criticism of the New Testament.

Van den Bergh van Eysinga replies to *Weber's* use of the epistles for evidence, renewing the position of *Steck*, that the author of Galatians betrays himself as a plagiarist from Romans and Corinthians, and that, the tone of Galatians being in general very calm, the obscurities of the epistle cannot be explained as due to the writer's excitement. Gal. 1, 8 f. reveals rhetorical affectation, not natural emotion. Gal. 2, 11 ff. is a clumsy abridgment of the dialectic of Romans, not a résumé of the debate with Peter; only a fanatical Paulinist could speak of 'dissimulation.' Van Eysinga infers from the difficulties that Galatians is not genuine, but a recension of a sub-judaistic pamphlet.

A. Fridrichsen presents difficulties as to the Pauline authorship of 1 Cor. 13. As it stands, it has the air of an interpolation, and its substance does not suit Paul. 'Knowledge',

which with Paul is the choicest fruit of the mature Christian life, is here identified with the common 'gnosis,' which he esteemed but lightly. 'Love,' which with Paul ranks as but one virtue among others (though thought of as socially active and greatly emphasized), is here made the central virtue, as self-assertion of the individual and control of the emotions. The tone of the encomium is cold and austere, corresponding to the restrained attitude and the implacability of the Stoa; it seems to be a protest against enthusiasm and to lie on the path of primitive Christianity toward a soberer ethics and ecclesiastical consolidation. Stoic parallels are given at length. The essay is interesting and of value, even if one agrees with the author's later conclusion (stated in a letter of September 30, 1924) that the hypothesis of interpolation cannot be maintained.

Lundberg contests the genuineness of Colossians on grounds of biblical theology, style, and chronology. (Fr.)

3. COMMENTARIES ON THE EPISTLES

Barth, K., Der Römerbrief. 2nd, newly revised edition. 523 pp. Munich, Chr. Kaiser, 1922. — *Windisch, H.*, Der zweite Korintherbrief (Meyer VI. 9th edition). 428 pp. — *Schmitz, O.*, Aus der Welt eines Gefangenen. Eine Einführung in den Philipperbrief. 2nd edition. 55 pp. Berlin, Furche-Verlag, 1924. — *Mpratsiotes, P. J.*, Ὑπόμνημα εἰς τὴν πρὸς Φιλήμονα ἐπιστολὴν Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. 142 pp. Athens, "Prometheus," 1923. — *Meinertz, M.*, Der Philemonbrief und die Persönlichkeit des Apostels Paulus. 25 pp. Düsseldorf, Schwann, 1921. — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Til Paulusbrevens hermeneutik (Festschrift for Lyder Brun, 215-223). Christiania, Gröndahl, 1922.

K. Barth published a second edition of his commentary on Romans (see HThR, 1922, 180) in a much altered form, and this new revision has since been several times reprinted. No book on theology for a long time has roused such intense interest as this commentary. In his introduction the author reproaches critical exegetes for remaining on the level of historical and critical interpretation, which should have been only the first step; it is much more important to "understand" the text and to discover "the real interest" of what is found there. What he means by this deeper penetration into the subject he now makes clear. It is a spacious re-interpretation in the light

of definite principles which are imposed upon the text of Paul, and with the help of a terminology mainly suggested by Kierkegaard. Several fundamental ideas of Paul are indeed more clearly understood by this means — his radical absolutism, his paradoxes and antitheses, the theocentric principle of his thought, and others. But in order to keep these ideas always in evidence, violence is often done to the language of Paul, especially in chaps. 13 and 7, and misinterpretation takes its place beside the re-interpretations of the spirit and of power.⁸²

Windisch (taking the place of the late Johannes Weiss) has written a wholly new work on 2 Corinthians in Meyer's Commentary. Besides the purely exegetical interest, the chief aim has been to solve the problems in the history of religion raised by the epistle and the problems of the personality of the great apostle; hence the excursus on *δόξα*, the heavenly body, death before the Parousia, reconciliation, ecstasies, Paul's sickness, the Trinity, and also the running comparisons with hellenistic philosophy and mysticism, as well as with the mysteries. The questions of introduction are freshly examined in connection with the exegesis. The author admits the fact of an intermediate letter and an intermediate visit, but does not identify the last four chapters with the intermediate letter. Since he finds it impossible to regard chaps. 10–13 as written either before chaps. 1–9 or at the same time with the latter, his view is that they formed a part of a letter posterior to 2 Corinthians (Krenkel's hypothesis). The integrity of chaps. 1–9 is also subject to some, though less serious, doubt. The aim of the commentary, however, is throughout to interpret the epistle in its present form and to analyze its component parts by criticism of the style.

O. Schmitz has painted a graphic picture of the thoughts of Paul while in prison, as revealed in the Epistle to the Philippians.

The commentary on Philemon by the Athenian theologian *Mpratsiotes*, which has been made accessible to me through a friend, is an able production and shows throughout good ac-

⁸² See A. Jülicher, ThLZ, 1922, no. 25; Bultmann, ChW, 1922, no. 18/20; Ph. Bachmann, NKZ, 1921, 517–547.

quaintance with the work of German and English scholars. Two valuable appendices are an excursus on slavery among the ancients and in the New Testament, and a comparison of the epistle with Pliny's two letters (ix. 21 and 24), which are given in Greek translation.⁸³ — *Meinertz*, in his rectoral address, studies the Epistle to Philemon for a view of the personality of the apostle and also treats the attitude of Paul toward slavery.

Von Dobschütz makes some valuable observations on Paul's manner of expression — his brevity, antitheses, changes of construction, and want of continuity. (Fr.)

4. THEOLOGY AND PIETY OF PAUL

a. General

Mundle, W., Das religiöse Leben des Apostel Paulus. 150 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1923. — *Schmitz*, O., Das Lebensgefühl des Paulus. 132 pp. Munich, C. H. Beck, 1922. — *Leisegang*, H., Der Apostel Paulus als Denker. 45 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1923. — *Pfister*, O., Die Entwicklung des Apostels Paulus. Eine religionsgeschichtliche und psychologische Skizze (Imago, vi, 1920, 243–292). — *Deissner*, K., Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit. 2nd edition. 148 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1921. — *Pieper*, K., Die Missionspredigt des heiligen Paulus. Ihre Fundstellen und ihr Inhalt. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung. 126 pp. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1921.

Mundle gives a description of the religious life of Paul by the 'phänomenologische Methode' in distinction from the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode.' This seems to mean that he tries to grasp the nature of the subject in itself without considering its environment. This method is not without its relative justification. Paul's conversion (Rom. 7 is used with due caution) was an enthusiastic turning away from the law to Christ. In his sketch of Christianity before Paul, *Mundle* opposes Heitmüller's and Bousset's view of the earliest hellenistic church, that it merely strengthened the 'Christus-cult.' Paul's own piety was essentially faith in Christ, which is interchangeable with mystical union with Christ. In some degree at variance with the mysticism stands Paul's hope of Christ. He lived in two worlds, which were not harmonized in his nature.⁸⁴

⁸³ See E. von Dobschütz, ThLZ, 1924, no. 20.

⁸⁴ See Strathmann, ThGg, 1924, 193 ff.

Schmitz also investigates Paul's religious personality and the inner structure of his piety. 'Lebensgefühl' is an elemental fact, not to be explained by cause and effect, and only susceptible of description in its entire psychological elaboration. The root and essence of the new 'Lebensgefühl' which Paul gained at his conversion (too much use is here made of Rom. 7) was the communion in the death and life of Christ, with its three-fold limitation, of continued subjection to the transitory world, continued suffering, and continued temptation. The new 'Lebensgefühl' gives us, in its three aspects, the receptive Paul, including the specifically 'religious' element in his character; the active Paul, under a commission from above, devoted to his charges, fighting with his enemies; and the suffering Paul, ready to suffer, sharing the sufferings of Christ, and victorious in the struggle. I know of no book which makes so vivid Paul's inner religious life in its whole range.⁸⁵

The young philosopher *Leisegang* has made a peculiar attempt to grasp the structure of Paul's feeling and thought. He believes that Paul thought in antitheses which moved in a circle. This is illustrated from Rom. 5 and 1 Cor. 15, 20-28; 44-57. Paul's logic was not like ours, being based on the law that opposite conceptions merge into one another. This is a specific technique of thinking—the 'dialectic,' as distinguished from the 'scholastic' and the 'empirical'—of the sort which was elaborated by Hegel and in Orphism. The latter is nearest to Paul's dialectic, as it takes the same circular course. In spite of many exaggerations, the essay develops a fruitful point of view.⁸⁶

Pfister's study is the first attempt to apply the psycho-analytic method to Paul's religious and ethical development, with abundant use also of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode.' Before Paul left Tarsus he came under the influence of Jewish and hellenistic mystery-religions. Conflicts, occasioned by the Mosaic prohibitions especially in sexual matters (see Rom. 7), led to severe self-reproach and a religion of neurotic anguish. In Jerusalem the successive phases were orthodoxy, ceremonial-

⁸⁵ See Jülicher, DLZ, 1924, no. 2 (not so favorable); Strathmann, ThGg, 1923, 282 f.

⁸⁶ See Jülicher, DLZ, 1924, no. 2 (unfavorable), and W. Bauer, ThLZ, no. 7.

ism, despair as to the 'law in the flesh,' fanaticism. He hated Christianity because it denied these values, and persecuted it in self-protection and by reason of his own inferiority-complex. What was left of the same impulses of his nature, together with the conscientious scruples stirred by the conduct of the Christians, produced an inner strain, and at the time of the hallucination before Damascus, an eruption took place of long-suppressed thoughts and of a yearning for the Saviour which he had long cherished. His new piety rests on the resumption of Jewish and hellenistic ideas and on Christian influences, which latter came to dominate because they had effected his deliverance from the suppression-neurosis. His pre-Christian ideas of the Jewish God, of law, and of Christ suffered metamorphosis into their opposites, and lived on in the antitheses of flesh and spiritual body, law and freedom, Jewish notions of God and Christ and the corresponding Christian ideas. The dogmatic combination of the hellenistic divine saviour with the Jewish-Christian idea of the Messiah, and the elimination of the historical Jesus, were necessary consequences of psychological laws. The mystery-cults contributed the abandonment of sacrifices, the identification of the believer with the divine Saviour, and baptism and the eucharist. More important is the christlike walking in love. Certain neurotic symptoms continued: seizures, ecstasies, speaking with tongues, as well as moods of distress, sub-moral judgments (marriage), but these did not essentially detract from the grandeur, boldness, and depth of Paul's piety and ethics. This interesting sketch is much affected not only by the psycho-analytic method but by the author's interpretations, especially of Rom. 7, and by the assumption of a strong influence on Paul from the mystery-religions. Heathen conceptions of worship are supposed to have had large effect on the Christian Paul, and the author is at pains to make this psychologically intelligible.

The second edition of *Deissner's* "Paulus und die Mystik seiner Zeit" was mentioned in HThR, 1922, 185 f. Bultmann, in ThLZ, 1922, no. 9, notes the absence of any reference to the difference between 'cultural' and 'spiritualistic' mysticism or

to the connection between mystical piety and gnostic speculation. Deissner's Paul is too much simplified and modernized.

Pieper gives a detailed study of Paul's preaching, dividing it into the preaching to win Jews and gentiles and the subsequent teaching. He regards Paul's speeches in Acts as a valuable source.

b. *Special Doctrines*

Krarpup, F. C., Et Stykke paulinsk Teologi (DTT, v, 2, 206-218). — *Sommerlath, E.*, Der Ursprung des neuen Lebens nach Paulus. 104 pp. Leipzig, Dörfing & Franke, 1923. — *Rodhe, E.*, Gottesglaube und Kyriosglaube bei Paulus (ZNTW, 1923, 43-57). — *Schmitz, O.*, Die Christusgemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Genetivgebrauchs (NtF, 1st ser., Paulusstudien, Heft 2). 270 pp. 1924. — *Weber, W.*, Christumystik. Eine religionspsychologische Untersuchung der paulinischen Christusfrömmigkeit (Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament, 10). 131 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1924. — *Mosbech, H.*, Paulus Laere om Loven (DTT, iv, 3, 108-137, 177-221). — *Bultmann, R.*, Das Problem der Ethik bei Paulus (ZNTW, 1924, 123-140). — *Tischleder, P.*, Wesen und Stellung der Frau nach der Lehre des Apostels Paulus (NA, x, 3-4). xv, 235 pp. 1923. — *Liechtenhan, R.*, Die göttliche Vorherbestimmung bei Paulus und in der Posidonianischen Philosophie (FRLanT, n. s. 18). 132 pp. 1922. — *Schmitz, O.*, Der Freiheitsgedanke bei Epiktet und das Freiheitszeugnis des Paulus (NtF, Paulusstudien, Heft 1). 80 pp. 1923. — *Meusel, H.*, Zur paulinischen Eschatologie (NKZ, 1923, 689-701).

Krarpup finds in Paul's doctrine of salvation an active and a passive strain; later ages have unduly emphasized the passive. (Fr.)

Sommerlath aims to show that the elevation to the new life in Paul rests on a wholly objective, that is, supernatural, foundation. Justification and 'new life' are but different names for the creation of communion with Christ. The author follows a distinctive 'inductive-psychological method.'⁸⁷

Rodhe urges, against Bousset, that faith in God is everywhere central in Paul, and that even in his worship of Christ and his Christ-mysticism, God is prominent. The combination of God and Christ (Kyrios) is essential in Paul and without analogy in the mystery-cults. The result is not the deification of Christ, but the christianizing of Paul's conception of God.

⁸⁷ See Jülicher, ThLZ, 1924, no. 14; Oepke, ThLBl, 1922, no. 1; Strathmann, ThGg, 1924, 191 f.

O. Schmitz, following a suggestion of Deissmann, has made a thorough study of Paul's use of the genitive in the phrases τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ, πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, etc., and finds that they do not fall under any of the distinctive kinds of genitive, but represent what grammarians call the 'genitive of mere connection.' These phrases furnish an adequate instrument of expression for the (unique) Pauline communion with Christ, but do not in themselves indicate the exact nature of the relation to God and to Christ intended. They are, in fact, "genitives of general characteristic," the two nouns taken together constituting a single term. The place of Paul's mystical conception of Christ in the history of religion is also considered, and careful distinctions from other types of mysticism, ancient and modern, are drawn. The book is of importance in both its parts, but exaggerates the applicability of this type of genitive in the epistles of Paul; see Dibelius, ThBl, Dec. 1924.

W. Weber, a pupil of Deissmann, follows the method of Girgensohn and Wobbermin in studying Paul's Christ-piety as a topic in the philosophy of religion. The main body of the book is a discussion of mysticism, including Paul's Christ-mysticism. With reference chiefly to the ideas of A. Ritschl, he develops his own view of mysticism as an essential element of genuine religious consciousness. Mystical piety is a definite form of consciousness in which the self is raised above the profane ego and enjoys immediate communion with God.

Mosbech has investigated Paul's attitude toward the law. The apostle's gradual progress toward matured principles in the matter is reflected in his mode of argument, which grows in definiteness but is traversed by inconsistencies. The development is to be seen in the sequence, 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Romans. The application of this theory in detail is interesting, but the theory itself is of doubtful validity. (Fr.)

Bultmann's work on the problem of ethics in Paul shows how stimulating the dialectic and terminology of K. Barth can be in the serious study of Paulinism, and at the same time how much caution must be exercised in applying Barth's categories to Paul. Bultmann begins with justification as the all-dominating doctrine. It means that the righteousness of God bestowed

on the believer definitely fixes the status of the justified, in independence of any subsequent act on his part. As to the imperative of duty, Bultmann rejects the usual view, that, *in concreto*, the believer must make this status real. His moral duty is solely obedience, the outward expression of his faith; the content is the same as before, for the continuity between the old and the new man is not broken (for the opposite view compare the Hermetic philosophy). Salvation and the new status rest exclusively on justification and are wholly invisible, incapable of being perceived. The Christian's obligation to duty, like all the rest of his existence, is the effect of grace. The aim of Bultmann's argument, to which it is impossible to do justice in a few sentences, is to show the supreme importance for ethics of the doctrine of justification; but he does not provide a satisfactory basis for the obligation of duty. This obligation cannot in all respects be derived from justification or from grace, and Paul's own words, especially in Rom. 6, show that for him the imperative of duty is all-embracing. It is really an essential point that the complete righteousness which the Christian attains has its perceptible as well as non-perceptible aspects. Bultmann also overlooks the fact that Paul recognizes a sacramental separation from sin, which is real and in which the continuity between the old man and the new is actually broken. The analogy of the Hermetic doctrine of rebirth and sanctification goes deeper than he admits. I have dealt with this matter more fully in an article, 'Das Problem des paulinischen Imperativs,' in ZNTW, 1924, 265-280.

Tischleder's historical study of Paul's teaching (including Hebrews) on the nature and position of woman alleges that Paul everywhere recognizes the properly regulated union of the sexes in monogamous marriage and grants women equality in religion. Beyond that, Paul's attitude is interpreted in Roman Catholic terms.⁸⁸

The two studies in comparative religion by Liechtenhan and Schmitz are full of interest. *Liechtenhan* contrasts Paul's idea of predestination and that of Posidonius, making clear the fundamental variance of the two in structure, motive, and appli-

⁸⁸ See E. von der Goltz, ThLZ, 1924, no. 14.

cation. Another fundamental idea in both systems is the sense of dependence, that common instinct which lies at the bottom of all religion; but Paul's position can be adequately explained from his own religious heritage, and nothing indicates any influence of either upon the other at this point. And the two conceptions differ in content. For Paul, predestination means redemption, historically conceived, and the destiny of the individual, while for Posidonius it is the cosmic process and the individual lot; but Paul is theocentric, Posidonius individualistic; Paul sees the path to fulfilment as a straight line, Posidonius as a circle. To this correspond further differences of a more general nature: Stoic thought is rationalistic and pantheistic; Paul starts from a belief in revelation, and his thought is dualistic. The Stoa is also dualistic, but it lacks the sense of distance, the consciousness of guilt, the need of redemption. In the antithesis of flesh and spirit there are resemblances, but in Paul this has an ethical bearing, in Posidonius it is more intellectualistic. Points of contact in the doctrine of creation Liechtenhan explains from Paul's use of prophetic and apocalyptic ideas. The two doctrines of divine providence show even more marked differences: the Stoic victory over the world is anthropocentric, moral; that of Paul, religious and theocentric. In the development of Pauline eschatology hellenistic influence (unconscious adaptation) can perhaps be traced, as in 2 Cor. 5, 1 ff., but development from within is a sufficient explanation. To sum up, Paul was acquainted with the Stoic doctrine of Posidonius, but its influence on him lies only on the circumference. In their totality the two systems are materially different. With reservations in detail this conclusion is sound, so far as Posidonius is concerned; and even the inclusion of Philo, Seneca, and Epictetus would not greatly change the aspect of the matter.

Schmitz compares Paul with Epictetus. The idea of freedom is aptly chosen as the starting-point for a study of the contacts and distinguishing character of the two great currents of thought, Hellenism and Christianity. With Epictetus the idea of freedom has indeed a religious coloring, but in substance it is a magnifying of the divine glory of man, that is, of the

'wise man.' There is a permanent line of cleavage here; man withdraws into himself, and yet adapts himself to custom; he is raised above fate, and nevertheless at last seeks salvation in flight by suicide. I would add that in Epictetus freedom is often renunciation and free subjection of self, sometimes to necessity, sometimes to God. That brings into a clearer light both resemblance and contrast to Paul; since for Paul also the conception of freedom includes emancipation from fate as a prominent element, and for Epictetus it has a religious foundation. Schmitz says that the term freedom had no importance in Paul's missionary preaching, but that may be questioned (compare Galatians, Rom. 6, 18 ff.). Paul too is not free from inner strains; freedom from the powers of the world, freedom from sin and the flesh and from all mankind, stand over against subjection to Christ, bondage to one's nature, and obligations to others. Nevertheless, Paul the man of the Spirit (*Pneumatiker*), who certainly has some kinship with the 'wise man' of the Stoics, never became the whole Paul. Schmitz makes some just observations on the limitations of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Methode,' in harmony with the views of Mundle. He emphasizes the differences: with Epictetus the nature of freedom is empirical, with Paul, religious; there, glorification of man, here, of God. But the antithesis is not absolute. Hellenistic influence on Paul is therefore not to be assumed. Here Schmitz goes too far; but he has rightly remarked the following contrasts: slavery lies for Epictetus in the realm of error, for Paul it is a stern reality; the source of freedom is found by Epictetus in a clarification of thought, by Paul in an historical redemption; to Epictetus the free man is his own master, to Paul he is bound to a new master; the Stoic aims at indifference to pain, Paul would drain the cup of suffering resolutely to the dregs; and so on. Yet Paul still betrays a trace of the Stoic consciousness of freedom.⁸⁹

Meusel attacks the familiar thesis that in 2 Cor. 5 and in Philippians Paul teaches an eschatology affected by hellenistic influence. The idea of immediate union with the Lord must

⁸⁹ See J. Weiss, *Die christliche Freiheit nach der Verkündigung des Apostels Paulus*, 1902.

already have been familiar to the apostle from Lk. 23, 43 and Acts 7, 57 ff. In the earlier epistles also Paul does not teach that death is followed by a sleep. 1 Thess. 4 does not mean an awakening from the sleep of death and a being brought from the grave to the Lord, but the passage from the invisible world into the visible, and a 'resurrection' in a glorified body. This explanation is hardly compatible with the language of 1 Thessalonians.⁹⁰

c. Single Passages in the Epistles

Kolmodin, A., Rom. 3, 21-26 (Festschrift for Stave, 232-245). — *Fridrichsen, A.*, Der wahre Jude und sein Lob. Röm. 3, 28 f. (SA, fasc. 1, 39-49). 1922. — *Göttsberger, J.*, Die Hülle des Moses nach Ex. 34 und 2 Kor. 3 (BiblZ, xvi, 1-17). — *Kögel, J.*, ὁ κύριος τὸ πνεῦμά ἐστιν (Aus Schrift und Geschichte, 35-46). — *Fridrichsen, A.*, Die Apologie des Paulus Gal. 1 (Brun-Fridrichsen, Paulus und die Urgemeinde, II. [Cf. HThR, 1922, 167.] NoTT, Beiheft 1). Giessen, Töpelmann, 1921. — *Brun, L.*, Zur Formel "in Christus Jesus" im Brief des Paulus an die Philipper (SA, fasc. 1, 19-37). — *Freese, F.*, τὸ κατέχον und ὁ κατέχων, 2 Thess. 2, 6-7 (ThStKr, 1921, 73-77). — *Kittel, G.*, Die γενεαλογίαι der Pastoralbriefe (ZNTW, 1921, 49-69). — *Eidem, E.*, Imitatio Pauli (Festschrift for Stave, 67-85). — *Preisker, H.*, Die Vikariatstaufe 1 Cor. 15, 19, ein eschatologischer, nicht sakramentaler Brauch (ZNTW, 1924, 298-304). — *Müllensieffen, W.*, Satan der θεὸς τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, 2 Kor. 4, 4? (ThStKr, 1924, 295-299).

Göttsberger expounds Ex. 34 as well as Paul's use of it in 2 Cor. 3. Paul does not speak there of the 'doing away' of the glory, but of the covenant; his exegesis corresponds with the original meaning of the Old Testament passage. — *Kögel* discusses 2 Cor. 3, 17 and criticizes Bousset (Kyrios Christos). The passage is not to be taken with reference to worship (*kultisch*), nor metaphysically, but soteriologically. It is as κύριος, who has entered into δόξα, that Christ is compared with the πνεῦμα. δόξα and πνεῦμα designate the saving activity and saving presence of God, which is mediated through Christ. In that sense, the Lord 'is' the Spirit.

Fridrichsen essays to prove that in Galatia the Judaizers reproached Paul with being a teacher of error and a mere tool of the latitudinarians in Palestine (Stephen and his followers), an opposition movement directed against the original apostles. They further alleged that at the council at Jerusalem he had

⁹⁰ See my Commentary on 2 Cor. 5.

submitted *laudabiliter* to the original apostles. Bultmann, ThLZ, 1922, no. 22, criticizes this interesting hypothesis.

Brun shows by the twenty places in Philippians where ἐν Χριστῷ occurs, that this formula denotes vital communion with Christ, and never expresses mysticism proper, mere community of thought and feeling, or refers to the spirit as an impersonal or half-personal element. — *Freese* proposes to connect ἐκ μέσου (2 Thess. 2, 6 f.) with ὁ κατέχων, and to translate it 'by half' (cf. Thuc. iv. 138). The sense would then be: 'only he who still half restrains the mystery of lawlessness must appear,' that is, 'the only thing lacking is that he should appear who up to the present (ἄρτι ἕως for ἕως ἄρτι) half holds it back.'

Kittel illustrates the γενεαλογίαι of the Pastoral Epistles from talmudic literature. Genealogies and the study of genealogies were highly valued by Jews and much discussed in all their minutiae, even to bitterness. In particular, genealogical discussions were carried on with the Minim; Jews and Christians disputed about the names of the mothers of David, Abraham, and Samson. These explanations prove that in the Pastoral Epistles we have to do with gnosticizing Judaism, and that the genealogies there referred to were Jewish. — *Eidem* discusses the passages in which Paul demands an imitation (μιμεῖσθαι) of himself, and shows that these always refer to single points, never to a general imitation. (Fr.) — *Preisker* gives an original explanation of 1 Cor. 15, 29. He thinks it relates not to the death of unbelievers but to that of unbaptized believers, for whom posthumous baptism is desired in order to complete 'the number' of the just and so hasten the coming of the final catastrophe. Cf. Enoch 47, 4; 4 Ezra 4, 35. — To the usual construction of the words (θεὸς) τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου *Müllensieffen* objects that it supposes the devil to be called 'god,' and implies that it is the devil who causes the blindness (contrary to 2 Cor. 3, 14 and Rom. 11, 8). He connects the genitive with τὰ νοήματα τῶν ἀπίστων, and points out New Testament analogies for such an order of words. The interpretation is found in many ancient fathers.

VII. THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS AND THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

Buhl, F., Hebraeerbrevet fortolket. 192 pp. Copenhagen, Hagerup, 1922. — *Büchsel, Fr.*, Die Christologie des Hebräerbriefs (BFchTh, xxvii, 2). 75 pp. 1922. — *Riggenbach, Ed.*, Der Begriff *τελειούν* im Hebräerbrief (NKZ, 1923, 184–195). — *Dibelius, M.*, Der Brief des Jakobus (Meyer's Kommentar, 7th edition). 240 pp. 1921.

Büchsel, in opposition to Holtzmann, Windisch, and others, endeavors to prove the unity of the christology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its foundation is the idea of the Son of God; as Son, Jesus Christ is promulgator of the word of God, Messiah, and mediator of creation. This at once provides for the identity of the pre-existent Son and the historical Jesus (Heb. 1, 1–3 is supposed to refer to the historical Jesus). Further, this christology, like all New Testament christology, is 'pneumatic' — hardly a happy designation — and not the product of syncretism. Between the metaphysical Christ and the historical Jesus there is no hiatus. The originality of Hebrews lies in its reference to Jesus as learning obedience, as being taught (as a son) by the father. In a 'pneumatic' christology, there is no inconsistency; the possibility of the Son's being tempted and his 'learning' present no contradiction.⁹¹

In the *Monatschrift für Pastoraltheologie* for 1921, p. 260ff., Th. Häring endeavored to show a connection between the word *τελειούν* in Hebrews and the language of the mysteries. *Riggenbach* concedes an influence of the mysteries on the Septuagint, where *τελειούν* is often equivalent to 'consecrate,' 'induct into a sacred office,' or 'devote to sacred use'; but he holds that it does not mean 'consecrate' but rather 'bring to fulfilment,' 'make real.'⁹²

Dibelius's commentary on James is an important contribution to learning. His leading idea is that the epistle is a working up of current proverbial material derived from a 'paraenetic' tradition; it is therefore not properly an epistle. The eclecticism with which the author selects from the abund-

⁹¹ See *Dibelius*, ThLZ, 1923, no. 21.

⁹² Compare Häring also in NKZ, 1923, 386–389.

ant paraenetic tradition, in order to meet the needs of the church, and the lack of connection are characteristic of this literary form. The principles of composition are the same as those of the Synoptic tradition: association by catch-words and a loose concatenation of kindred or contrasted ideas. The author, or rather the compiler, was not James the Lord's brother, but wrote under that pseudonym. Thus is answered the question, Jewish or Christian? The material taken over is mainly Jewish, but is slightly, though not completely, christianized. A special characteristic of the work is its patriarchally pietistic ethics of poverty, its pauperistic hostility to wealth, and its apocalyptic expectation of punishment for the rich. James belongs in the class of religious literature for the poor, and is to be dated between 80 and 130. In the light of this general view Dibelius gives an interpretation of James in detail that is in many respects original. Special attention is paid to the literary analysis of each section, and new light shed on many passages. Hellenistic paraenetic literature is abundantly used, and the author shows unusual knowledge of general literature. Dibelius often agrees with Ropes, but in many respects carries farther the latter's work.⁹³

VIII. NEW TESTAMENT APOCRYPHA

Hennecke, E., Neutestamentliche Apokryphen. 2nd, fully revised edition. xii, 32, and 668 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1924. — *Bakels, H.*, Nieuwtestamentische Apocriefen (Wereldbibliotheek). 2 vols. 416, 354 pp. Amsterdam, 1922. — *Von Harnack, A.*, Einige Worte die nicht in unsren Evangelien stehen (Erforschtes und Erlebtes, 44-52); Der apokryphe Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Laodicener, eine Marcionitische Fälschung aus der zweiten Hälfte des zweiten Jahrhunderts (SAB, 1923, 27). 10 pp. — *Weinelt, H.*, Die spätere christliche Apokalyptik (Eucharisterion, II, 141-173).

Of *Hennecke's* former two volumes (1904) the new revision covers only the text, so that the Handbuch of the first edition, with learned notes, is still indispensable. The text-volume of 1904 also retains its value, since some of the introductions are seriously curtailed. In other respects the new volumes give a wholly new treatment, with a revision of all the introductions

⁹³ See also Bultmann, DLZ, 1924, no. 5; Hadorn, ThLB, 1922, no. 1; Fiebig, LZB, 1921, no. 30; Deissner, ThGg, 1921, 223 ff.

and large additions of material everywhere. Of special importance are Waitz's introductions to the Gospels of the Nazarenes, the Ebionites, and the Hebrews. New sections give A. Meyer's account of the family of Jesus according to historical and apocryphal tradition and the editor's collection of the notices of the apostles, as well as extracts from the pseudo-clementine literature. The number of apocalyptic and prophetic texts has been much increased, and a new translation of the Odes of Solomon is contributed by Gressmann. Among the Church Orders an extract from that of Hippolytus is included. Under the heading of 'proverbial wisdom,' the Sayings of Sextus, in their christianized form, edited and translated by Kroll, have been added.⁹⁴

Bakels, a retired pastor, has assembled and translated all the more personal notices about Jesus and his parents, the apostles, and others, taking the extracts principally from writers of the first two centuries. He has added introductions and notes.

Harnack's exposition of certain extra-canonical sayings of Jesus is based in part on an article in the *Abhandlungen* of the Berlin Academy for 1904. He starts with Acts 20, 35 and Lk. 6, 5 (Codex Bezae) and goes on to some *agrapha* found in the church fathers. In all the sayings he finds some relation to the historical gospel.

Harnack's view that the apocryphal Epistle to the Laodiceans is a Marcionite forgery rests on the following grounds: the epistle begins with the 'anti-catholic' words of Gal. 1, 1; the point of view is christocentric; the exclusive correctness of Paul's preaching is emphasized; *veritas evangelii* and *vita aeterna* are catch-words of the Marcionites; the modification of Phil. 2, 12 serves to exalt the dignity of Paul. The author is not Marcion himself, who designated Ephesians as the Epistle to the Laodiceans, but a follower, perhaps the same who wrote the prologue to the epistles of Paul.⁹⁵

Weinel gives for the first time a complete survey of the apocryphal apocalypses of later times, including (1) those written in the name of Christians, as the *Testamentum domini*

⁹⁴ See M. R. James, *JThSt*, 1923-24.

⁹⁵ See J. Behm, *ThLZ*, 1924, no. 14.

nostri Jesu Christi, the apocryphal Apocalypse of John, etc.; (2) Christian apocalypses written in the name of Old Testament personages, such as Ezra, Adam, etc.; (3) Christian apocalypses with a Jewish foundation, such as the Apocalypse of Zephaniah, the Apocalypse of Elias, the Apocalypse and Testament of Abraham. He gives detailed analyses of the contents, from which the nature and scope of the works can be learned, also bibliographies. His essay is an incentive to the reading and study of the originals.

IX. PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY

1. GENERAL

Meyer, Eduard, Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums. 3 vols. 340 pp. 1921; 462 pp. 1921; 660 pp. 1923. Stuttgart, Cotta. — *Chamberlain, H. S.*, Mensch und Gott. Betrachtungen über Religion und Christentum. 305 pp. Munich, Bruckmann, 1921.

The much-discussed monumental work of *Eduard Meyer* is indeed a wonderful achievement. Its obvious defects may be assigned to several causes. Thus he follows Harnack too closely as to the historical value of Acts (that a secular historian accepts Acts as a history is remarkable); secondly, he pays no attention to the most recent literary criticism of the gospels; and thirdly, especially for Paul, he emphasizes secular motives to the neglect of theological and religious forces, and in general takes too rationalistic a view of religious phenomena. Nevertheless the work is a wonderful achievement, in the abundance of its valuable, interesting, and stimulating material. — Volume I is a criticism of sources, after a kind. Original, though not convincing, is the attempt to show that Mark is based on a 'disciples-source' and an 'apostles-source.' It is a surprise to find Meyer's attitude toward tradition conservative, both about and within Mark and Luke. The transfiguration was an historical event with far-reaching consequences; the messianic consciousness of Jesus is recognized. In John a separate source is suspected. Meyer would derive the Johannine logos from Jewish conceptions. Volume II deals with the development of Judaism and with Jesus of Nazareth. Here the author is on

his own ground. An *hors d'oeuvre* is the chapter on the religion of Zoroaster, appropriately put here because of the infiltration of Parsee ideas into Judaism. The use of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs and especially the Damascus document for the pre-Christian history of Judaism, is noteworthy. The Revelation of John is adduced and analyzed as evidence of the receptivity of syncretistic Judaism in Asia Minor. The portrayal of Jesus is important, in spite of the neglect of modern research; Jesus is not the founder of a new religion, but the consummator of Judaism, and therefore the Messiah. On this chapter on Jesus see especially E. von Dobschütz, *ThStKr*, 1922, 190 ff.; Deissner, *ThGg*, 1922, 247 ff.; Büchsel, *NKZ*, xxiii, 269-282. Volume III deals with the apostolic and post-apostolic age in relation to general secular history. Unsatisfactory and masterly chapters here alternate. In the detailed criticism of Acts Meyer supports the trustworthiness of the book. Its close is explained on the ground that the martyrdom of Paul, while taken as a matter of course, would yet, if expressly told, have been discordant with the idea of the guidance of Christianity by the Spirit. In spite of Meyer's usual rejection of recent hypotheses, it is a surprise that he accepts the early date of the martyrdom of John, and accordingly assumes a correction in Acts 12. His argument for the South Galatian hypothesis deserves notice. The second part of Volume III turns to the beginnings of Christianity. In the faith and enthusiasm of the primitive church is reflected the overwhelming impression made by the nature and personality of Jesus. The unhellenic character of Paul and of his teaching is especially emphasized. A certain diplomatic trait in his character is brought out rather too strongly, Romans, for example, being called a masterpiece of diplomacy, and the view rejected which denies all relation to ecclesiastical policy in Romans. The account of Paul's theology lacks warmth. In the Corinthian controversies, Meyer assigns an active rôle to Peter, for whom in general he has a special interest. In the Johannine writings Meyer distinguishes three figures: the apostle, the presbyter, and the author of Revelation, besides the unknown author of the Gospel and the Epistles. At the close he corrects what he had said about Me-

tatron and Memra, in accordance with the studies of G. F. Moore in *HThR*, 1921-1922.⁹⁶

From *H. S. Chamberlain* we have another picture of primitive Christianity, at least of the two leading figures, Jesus and Paul, but he frames it with an introduction drawn from the philosophy of religion and reflections on church, dogma, and the gospel. Jesus is approached solely on his religious side, as preacher of the fatherhood of God and the present kingdom of God, and as the mediator over against mankind. As an anti-semite, the writer withdraws Jesus as much as possible from Jewish soil.⁹⁷ The same tendency is seen in his rejection of the eschatological element, his transmutation of the central ideas into those of John, and his treatment of the Johannine sayings as genuine words of Jesus. He introduces into his portrait of Jesus strange tones, some taken from the Vedanta, some due to his veneration for Richard Wagner.⁹⁸ The effort to separate the Jewish from the universal human elements is still more evident in the treatment of Paul, in which he stresses the influence of Hellenism (Reitzenstein). Redemption, regeneration, grace, and even faith, are all hellenistic concepts. Paul conceives of Christ chiefly as mediator, certainly not as God. Myth and mysticism in Paul are to be distinguished; only in the latter is there union with Jesus. Chamberlain is widely read in theology, both English and German, and his judgment is frequently determined by his choice of authorities. His anti-semitism is an important, but in my opinion not an actually distorting, influence. The charm of his book comes from the fact that he is not an historian at all, but interprets the New Testament writings in the spirit of Plato, Goethe, and Kant.

⁹⁶ See the reviews (more or less decidedly unfavorable) by K. L. Schmidt, *ChW*, 1921, no. 7; Dibelius, *DLZ*, 1921, 225 ff., 1922, 999 ff., 1924, 1636 ff.; R. Schütz, *ThBl*, 1922, no. 4; 1924, no. 6; and, on the other side, Lietzmann, *HZ*, 1922, 137, Heft 1; Jülicher, *ThLZ*, 1922, no. 24; 1924, no. 16.

⁹⁷ For thoroughgoing anti-semitic representations of Jesus, see A. Dinter, *Das Evangelium unseres Herrn und Heilandes Jesu Christi*, 398 pp., Langensalza, 1923; and E. Jung, *Die geschichtliche Persönlichkeit Jesu*, 352 pp., Munich, Deutschlandverlag, 1924. Cf. Strathmann, *ThGg*, 1924, 185 f.

⁹⁸ See E. von Dobschütz, *ThStKr*, 1922, 187-190.

2. SPECIAL STUDIES

a

Van Leeuwen, J. A. C., Het probleem van den oorsprong der christelijke religie. 34 pp. Utrecht, van Druten, 1922.

b

Schmitz, O., Die Vorbildlichkeit der urchristlichen Gemeinden für die Kirche der Gegenwart. 2nd edition. 60 pp. Berlin, Furche-Verlag, 1922. — *Schütz, R.*, Apostel und Jünger. Eine quellenkritische und geschichtliche Untersuchung über die Entstehung des Christentums. 118 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1921. — *Holl, K.*, Der Kirchenbegriff des Paulus in seinem Verhältnis zu dem der Urgemeinde (SAB, 1921, 920-947). — *Kattenbusch, F.*, Die Vorzugstellung des Petrus und der Character der Urgemeinde zu Jerusalem (Festgabe für K. Müller, 322-351), 1922. — *Mundle, W.*, Das Kirchenbewusstsein der ältesten Christenheit (ZNTW, 1923, 20, 42). — *Michaelis, W.*, Die neutestamentlichen Wurzeln des Katholizismus (Der deutsche Aufbau, v, nos. 15-17).

c

Rust, H., Wunder der Bibel. I. Die Visionen des Neuen Testaments. II. Das Zungenreden im Neuen Testament (Die okkulte Welt. Heft 67/70, 103). Pfullingen, Baum, 1922, 1924; Das Zungenreden. Eine Studie zur kritischen Religionspsychologie (Grenzfragen des Nerven- und Seelenlebens. Heft 118). 72 pp. Munich, Bergmann, 1924. — *Linderholm, E.*, Pingströrelsen. Dess förutsättningar och uppkomst. 315 pp. Stockholm, Bonnier, 1924.

d

Wetter, Gillis P:son, Det urkristna gudstjänstlivet och Nya Testamentet. 32 pp. Stockholm, Geber, 1923. — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Kultusens betydning för urkristendommens fromhet og troslaere (NoTT, xxiii, 8-35). — *Nägelsbach, F.*, Der Name Gottes und Jesu nach dem Verständnis und dem Sprachgebrauch der heiligen Schrift. 78 pp. Munich, Müller & Fröhlich, 1921. — *Walther, G.*, Die Entstehung des Taufsymbols aus dem Taufritus (ThStKr, 1924, 256-271). — *Fridrichsen, A.*, Den treleddede formel Matt. 28, 19 og dapeen til de tre navn (NoTT, xxiii, 65-81).

e

Hauck, F., Die Stellung des Urchristentums zu Arbeit und Geld (BFchTh, 2nd ser. vol. 3). 168 pp. 1921. — *Lohmeyer, E.*, Soziale Fragen im Urchristentum (Wissenschaft und Bildung, 172). 136 pp. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer, 1921. — *Rauer, W.*, Die "Schwachen" in Korinth und Rom (BiblSt, xxi, 2-3). Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1923.

a

Van Leeuwen, in his rectoral address at Utrecht, gives a general view of the problems relating to the origin of the Christian religion: the continuity between Jesus and Paul, the mo-

tives prompting the composition of the gospels, Jesus' consciousness of his messiahship as an indispensable factor in his development, and the relation of Jesus to God.

b

Schmitz regards the primitive churches as a model in three aspects: (1) their formulation of the Christian message of a personal calling by God and the union of the called in the church; (2) their elaboration of a confession of faith which included deeds and readiness to suffer; (3) their common life with its work in the freedom of love, its willing subjection to appointed leaders and to the guidance of the Spirit, who regulates and satisfies the interests and needs of life.

R. Schütz uses a fresh analysis of sources in Acts to support a new view of the earliest history of the Christian mission. He distinguishes between an 'apostles-source,' in which the twelve apostles at Jerusalem were represented as holding direction of the church and the mission, and a 'disciples-source,' in which the Jerusalem apostles were ignored and the mission carried on in hellenistic spirit and on hellenistic soil. These two tendencies he finds also in the Synoptic tradition — on the one hand Judaistic, with the dogma of the Son of Man, and on the other hand, universalistic, with the worship of the Kyrios. The hellenistic propaganda attached itself directly to the Galilean mission of Jesus. This suggestive construction has many weak points. The chief and critical objection is that the apostolic disciples, who came from Galilee, would not have been likely to pursue a strictly Jerusalemite and non-galilean ecclesiastical policy, and on the other hand that the Galilean mission of Jesus can hardly have been so speedily hellenized.⁹⁹

In his important study of Paul's idea of the church, *Karl Holl* argues, in opposition to *Sohm*, that a legitimate hierarchy and a divinely given ecclesiastical law had existed at Jerusalem long before 1 Clement. This he infers from the title *στῦλοι*, and the name *Κηφᾶς*, from Matt. 16, 18, from the official Jerusalem account of the appearances of Jesus (1 Cor. 15, 3 ff.), and from the idea of the martyr-apostle. As a church led by apostles,

⁹⁹ See Lake, HThR, 1922, 97 ff.; Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 264 ff.

Jerusalem claimed a right of supervision over all other churches (hence the conflicts in Pauline churches), as well as a right to financial support. The contribution of money was not claimed because of the necessities of the Jerusalem church, but because it was the mother-church, with the honorary title of *οἱ ἅγιοι*; it was a kind of right of taxation. Paul adopted this idea of the church (including a certain reverence for Jerusalem), but made important changes in it, of which the chief was a reduction of the authority of the original apostles and the original church (the apostles were called merely 'servants of the Lord'; beside them were other 'men of the Spirit' [πνευματικοί]; all Christians were ἅγιοι). Thus he cleared the way for the primacy of Rome, and yet could not prevent the Twelve from ranking above him.¹⁰⁰

Kattenbusch supplements his paper on Matt. 16, 18 (see above, p. 57, Logia). He agrees in part with Holl, but not entirely. The primacy of Peter was only 'charismatic'; Peter was the theologian of the church. The twelve apostles, the dignity of whose position *Kattenbusch* also sets very high, formed the core of the primitive church, and the latter was believed to represent the true people of God.¹⁰¹

Mundle also makes some corrections on Holl, particularly on his use of 1 Cor. 15, 3 ff. He questions the view that the original apostles claimed the right to supervise gentile churches and that the Judaizers were the commissioned agents of the mother church. Also he holds that the vast claims made for itself by the church of Jerusalem and the religious reverence for the city of Jerusalem are not attested by the sources. On the other hand, *Mundle* agrees in emphasizing the importance attaching to Peter for the Catholic idea of the church; he calls him its creator. The monarchical position of Paul in his churches and the close connection of the idea of the church with his Christ-mysticism and with worship are in his view fundamental. This Pauline conception of church and gospel, not that of the first congregation, gained the victory; the later church became Pauline. — *Michaelis* opposes Heiler's asser-

¹⁰⁰ See Jülicher, ThLZ, 1922, no. 5.

¹⁰¹ See Jülicher, ThLZ, 1922, 97-99.

tion that the catholicizing of early Christianity began in the primitive church and in Paulinism.

c

Rust, in the first part of his "Miracles of the Bible," tries to throw the light of modern psychology of religion on those psychic miracles of revelation in the New Testament which are to be termed visions. Having classified visions as hallucinations, illusions, imaginative visions and the like, and trance-visions, he discusses the genuine visions of the New Testament and assigns characters to them. The visions were important because they gave rise to new stories of Jesus' death. The second part is a study of the speaking with tongues, preceded by an investigation of the psychology and typology of the phenomenon. With glossolalia Rust includes early Christian prophecy as automatic speech. He distinguishes sharply between 1 Cor. 14 and Acts 2. For the latter he proposes several possible explanations, and his work must be the foundation of future exegesis of the chapter.

Linderholm writes on "ecstasy, miracle, and apocalyptic in the Bible and in the popular belief of the present day." (Fr.)

d

Von Dobschütz gives a concise account of the significance of worship in primitive Christianity, for the sense of community and of equality, for communion with God and Christ, and for the development of religious ideas. He discusses particularly the sacraments and the worship of Christ, with an attitude of reserve toward recent views of the significance of mystical worship in early Christianity. He thinks that the change to a religion of sacramental worship came later. (Fr.)

Wetter gives a brief account of the traces of primitive Christian worship in the New Testament (liturgical formulas, ideas, forms of language, etc.). The worship also influenced literature, as in the stories of the passion. The author urges the need of studying the religion of the masses. (Fr.)

Nägelsbach argues against the view of Heitmüller and others, that the 'name' in the New Testament possesses a



magical power, or that name and nature are the same thing. According to Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 272, he does not do justice to the realism of the Bible and is inclined to modernize biblical ideas.

Walther shows that with Paul baptism is not merely a cleansing, but a real death and resurrection and more than a symbol; and that in other writings there is more than the idea of washing away sin. These profounder ideas as to the meaning of the rite must have been imparted to candidates for baptism beforehand, and out of this instruction grew the baptismal symbol, the kernel of which must have been the three points of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ. Hence the teaching of Christ and his work as Saviour are passed by in the baptismal creeds which grew out of the interpretation of baptism.

Fridrichsen explains the origin of the three-fold formula of baptism as developed from one with two parts (God and Christ). The early addition of the Spirit was due partly to the general tendency to use the number three, partly to the customs of worship in prayer and hymn, partly to the form of baptismal instruction and to the ceremony itself (water and Spirit). (Fr.)

e

F. Hauck, the reviser of Zahn's Commentary on Paul, discusses the attitude of Jesus toward labor and money, and the influence of his ideas in the primitive church, in Pauline and Johannine circles, and in the post-apostolic and early Catholic periods. By comparison with Jewish and Graeco-Roman ideas, he brings out the distinctive character of the New Testament view, and insists (against Kautsky) on the religious and not economic origin of the early Christian attitude. Jesus' denunciation of social sins is far less essential to his teaching than in the case of the prophets. In the Epistle of James the antagonism to the rich is sharper. Paul emphasizes the duty of labor, and has no harsh words for the rich or concerning money. Except for the idea of the *κόσμος* and the warning against *πλεονεξία* (1 John 2, 15), the Johannine writings furnish little material, but the Didache and Hermas are more fruitful. Hauck goes on

to discuss Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and the Encratites. His judgments are generally sound. As he points out, social aims, interests, and theories were not a part of original Christianity, but appeared later, and under hellenistic influence.¹⁰²

Lohmeyer's book on social questions in primitive Christianity is full of creative construction, vivid description of 'spheres,' and rhetorical portrayal and appreciation of leading figures; utterances on social themes are brought into relation with theological views and the philosophy of history. The influence of Troeltsch and other social theorists is very evident, as well as the effect of the revolution in Germany. In literary merit and in learning this work is superior to that of Hauck, but in historical exegesis its statements of fact need everywhere to be verified before acceptance. After an interesting introduction on the meaning of 'social' and 'society,' and the interaction of social and religious forces in history, the author sketches the economic and social life of Hellenism, of the Roman period and world, and of the Jews. The decisive factor in Jesus' attitude in these matters was his absolute indifference to the world; his positive attitude was non-cosmical brotherly love. An ingenious reconstruction of Paul's social teaching represents its background as predestination, hope of the parousia and the future life, and world-shunning mysticism; its concrete character is patriarchally conservative. The later periods and groups of early Christianity show more interest in the needs and duties of community life, with a gradual waning of the apocalyptic hope and the rise of an ascetic ideal.¹⁰³

Rauer's learned study of the 'weak' in Corinth and Rome comes to the conclusion that these groups in both churches were of gentile origin. In Corinth the weak dreaded a contact with demons through eating sacrificial meat. In Rome, ascetic motives controlled the weak, who had perhaps been earlier associated with the Orphic mysteries and derived thence their vegetarian tendencies. The observance of 'days' means fasting every day, in contrast to observing certain fast-days.

¹⁰² Compare Preisker, ThBl, 1923, no. 1.

¹⁰³ See Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 279 f.

X. THEOLOGY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

1. GENERAL

Kaftan, J., Zur Frage nach der Aufgabe der neutestamentlichen Theologie (Festgabe für Harnack, 134-143). — *Weinel, H.*, Biblische Theologie des Neuen Testaments. Die Religion Jesu und des Urchristentums. 3rd edition. xv, 675 pp. Tübingen, Mohr, 1921. — *Feine, P.*, Theologie des Neuen Testaments. 4th edition newly revised. xiv, 456 pp. 1922; Die Religion des Neuen Testaments. 287 pp. Leipzig, Quelle & Meyer, 1921.

Julius Kaftan criticizes the views of Wrede, Wernle, and Weinel on New Testament theology. He approves emphasis on the religion, in comparison with the theology, but objects to bringing in uncanonical sources. The New Testament is a self-contained factor in history. An account of early Christianity such as Weinel gives in his New Testament Theology is a chapter of church history, not of New Testament theology. The great question which New Testament theology has to answer is that of how the bizarre apocalyptic ideas of later Judaism can have produced the universal, spiritual, and ethical religion of Christianity.

Weinel's new edition has already been mentioned in HThR, 1922, p. 200.¹⁰⁴

The changes made in the fourth edition of *Feine's* New Testament Theology are chiefly abridgments. The few additions include discussions of Buddhism and mysticism and of talmudic parallels. In many respects the third edition is to be preferred to the fourth.¹⁰⁵ — *Feine* has supplemented his "Theology" by a book on the Religion of the New Testament, with a more synthetic presentation. He emphasizes once more the unity of the New Testament doctrine, especially in his detailed discussion of the problem of 'Jesus and Paul,' and uses the Johannine material in describing the religion of Jesus. Naturally he denies any considerable influence from the mystery religions.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ See also Bertram, ThBl, 1922, no. 11; W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1923, no. 3.

¹⁰⁵ See W. Bauer, ThLZ, 1923, no. 3.

¹⁰⁶ See Dibelius, ThLZ, 1922, no. 10; Deissner, ThGg, 1921, 236 ff.

2. SPECIAL STUDIES

a

Schmidt, K. L., Eschatologie und Mystik im Urchristentum (ZNTW, 1922, 277-291). — *Weinel, H.*, Die Hauptrichtungen der Frömmigkeit des Abendlandes und das Neue Testament. 27 pp. Jena, Fischer, 1921. — *Werner, M.*, Der Einfluss paulinischer Theologie im Markus-evangelium. Eine Studie zur neutestamentlichen Theologie (ZNTW, Beiheft 1). 216 pp. 1923.

b

Von Dobschütz, E., Rationales und irrationales Denken über Gott im Urchristentum (ThStKr, 1924, 235-255).

c

Bousset, W., Kyrios Christos. Geschichte des Christusglaubens von den Anfängen des Christentums bis Irenaeus. 2nd edition, revised. xx, 394 pp. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1921. — *Förster, W.*, Herr ist Jesus. Herkunft und Bedeutung des urchristlichen Kyrios-Bekenntnisses (NtF, 2nd ser. Heft 1). 272 pp. 1924. — *Klaweth, A.*, Das Gebet zu Jesus. Seine Berechtigung und seine Uebung nach den Schriften des Neuen Testaments (NA, vi, 5). 120 pp. 1921. — *Von Dobschütz, E.*, Kristustro og Kristentliv. 75 pp. Christiania, Norli, 1922. — *Preisker, H.*, Die Liebe im Urchristentum und in der alten Kirche (ThStKr, 1924, 272-294).

A

Schmidt's aim is to show how the two seemingly opposed currents of thought, eschatology and mysticism, effected a combination in Christianity. On the one hand Christianity retained its character as an eschatological religion far down into its so-called hellenistic period, while on the other its mystical quality can be traced back to the beginnings. The explanation is that passage from transcendence to immanence is not abrupt. An intense hope may turn into mysticism, and mysticism is capable of strengthening eschatological passion. Early Christian eschatology and mysticism rested upon one another, and on hellenistic soil eschatology came into close touch with hellenistic mysticism.

Similar, though not identical, is *Weinel's* account of the main types of New Testament piety. He follows Söderblom in distinguishing between prophetic religion (religion of reverence) and mystical religion, and describes the combination of the two in the New Testament. Jesus is purely an example of the prophetic type, while in Paul mysticism is added, although

the religion of reverence is still dominant. Mysticism reached its highest development in John, but even there remains subordinate to the religion of faith and love. The article ends with an excursus on Stoic and apocalyptic influences in the New Testament.

Werner, privat-docent at Berne, maintains that Mark shows no Pauline influence. The agreements of Mark with Paul relate solely to common Early Christian conceptions. For the characteristic ideas of Paul Mark either has no parallels or else shows a diametrically opposite point of view. The argument is very thorough and in the main convincing. The comparison of the two series of ideas (christology, law, gospel, faith; eschatology, Jews, gentiles, etc.) is highly instructive, and the book is not without importance for the problem of Jesus and Paul.

b

Von Dobschütz studies the question of how far the New Testament thought of God is rational and how far irrational. Jesus stands above this contrast, speaking paradoxically but not irrationally about God and his dealings. Especially his parables are immediately intelligible; and even in the matter of eschatology, where in Judaism irrational ideas dominate, the irrational element is with him quite subordinated. He simply states what follows of itself from his attitude toward God; his trust in God is neither founded on reason nor established upon unreason. The theology of Paul on the other hand is decidedly irrational, and irrational motives rule in his teaching of the divine counsels, of the death of Christ, and of justification. The theology of Hebrews again is rational; God's procedure, his sending of Christ, the whole work of Christ, is represented as reasonable and necessary; and this is still more strongly the case in the Epistle of Barnabas. The irrationalism of Paul has its roots in prophetism (Isaiah); the rationalism of Hebrews and Barnabas shows the stamp of Greek popular philosophy, perhaps brought in through the medium of Jewish Hellenism.

c

G. Krüger has brought out the new (posthumous) edition of *Bousset's Kyrios Christos*. The author left a complete revi-

sion of the first four chapters; elsewhere no changes have been made in the new edition. The revision relates to the pre-pauline use of the title 'kyrios,' and to the fourth chapter, on Paul. The essay entitled *Jesus der Herr* (1916), written in answer to Wernle, is not incorporated into the book and remains independently valuable.¹⁰⁷ — *W. Förster*, discussing Bousset's views, denies the hellenistic origin of the Christian title 'kyrios,' and derives it rather from the personal relation of the disciples to Jesus. The title 'rabbi' was itself an expression of respect, but Jesus was also addressed as *marî*, and thereby was intended both courteous address and submission to his will. Förster suspects that already in Jerusalem Jesus became 'Lord' in a higher and religious sense; and supports this from the sayings to the disciples and from the eschatological parables. Here is the starting-point for the reverence for Jesus as 'kyrios' on the part of the apostolic church, as well as for Paul's kyrios-doctrine. The meaning of the confession 'Jesus is Lord' is evident from the correlative *δοῦλος*. Jesus is Lord because he requires and receives obedience to his announcement of the divine will. If the title can thus be derived from the inner situation of the disciples, no borrowing from non-christian religious usage need be assumed, the more so that *κύριος* in these religions denotes neither in general the god of the cult nor specifically the saviour-god. Least of all is a derivation from the emperor-worship likely, since in that worship *κύριος* had no religious meaning whatever, but merely designated the secular ruler. The investigation is elaborate and includes statistical tables, but it does not seem to me a complete refutation of Bousset's position; see Windisch, *NThT*, 1925, 274–276.

Klaweth discusses the biblical basis for prayer to Jesus: the Old Testament worship of the Messiah, Jesus' own attitude (with an examination of the use of *προσκυνεῖν*), the kyrios-worship of the earliest congregation, the few examples in Paul of invocation of Jesus, and the later testimony, including the Apostolic Fathers. He examines minutely the idea of the medi-

¹⁰⁷ See Harnack, *ThLZ*, 1922, no. 7, who writes in appreciation of the work, but finds Bousset's explanation of the origin and rise of the title to be untenable, and states afresh his principles with regard to the 'religionsgeschichtliche Schule.'

ation of prayer through Christ, in which he admits a connection with syncretism and the popular views of the time; Paul, however, distinctly corrected the popular idea by making Jesus the only mediator, combining the idea of mediation with that of supporting the petition, and including prayers of praise and thanksgiving. The whole idea of the mediator in Paul is a function of the Logos.

Von Dobschütz's little book is a translation into Norwegian of three lectures delivered in Christiania in 1921 on the subjects of the rise of the Christian faith; the man-of-to-day's idea of Christ; and the gospel, mysticism, and asceticism. (Fr.)

Preisker describes the idea of love in primitive Christianity and thereafter as far as Clement and Origen. In primitive Christianity love is unlimited and enthusiastic, active and social; it is the dominant virtue, a joyful sentiment called forth by the experience of the love of God, and therefore finds its highest expression in self-sacrificing service. In later Christianity love was thought of as one virtue among others, limited to brethren; it lost its close relation to faith, became a duty imposed from without, reckoned up services, became moralistic and intellectualistic, gained a more negative character and a more eudaemonistic source.

XI. THE INVESTIGATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BY THE AID OF THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS

II

Clemen, C. Religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung des Neuen Testaments. Die Abhängigkeit des ältesten Christentums von nichtjüdischen Religionen und philosophischen Systemen, zusammenfassend untersucht. 2nd, fully revised edition. iv, 440 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1924.

b

Wetter, Gillis P:son, Kristendomen och hellenismen. 180 pp. Stockholm, Geber, 1913. — *Thune Jacobsen, O.*, Antikken og Kristendommen. Kristendommens sprindelse. 222 pp. Copenhagen, Madsen, 1922.

c

Reitzenstein, R., Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium. 272 pp. Bonn, Marcus & Weber, 1921; Iranischer Erlösungsglaube (ZNTW, 1921, 1-22); Gedanken zur Entwicklung des Erlösungsglaubens (HZ, cxxvi, 1922, 1-57). — *Gressmann, H.*, Das religionsgeschichtliche Problem des Ursprungs der

hellenistischen Erlösungsreligion (ZKG, n. s. iii, 1922, 178-190; iv, 154-180). — *Scheftelowitz, I.*, Die Entstehung der Manichäischen Religion und des Erlösungsmysteriums. 86 pp. Giessen, Töpelmann, 1922.

d

Norden, E., Die Geburt des Kindes. Geschichte einer religiösen Idee. vii, 172 pp. Leipzig, Teubner, 1924. — *Leipoldt, J.*, Sterbende und aufstehende Götter. Ein Beitrag zum Streit um Arthur Drews' Christusmythe. 82 pp. Leipzig, Deichert, 1923. — *Leisegang, H.*, Pneuma hagian. Der Ursprung des Geistbegriffs der synoptischen Evangelien aus der griechischen Mystik (Veröffentlichungen des Forschungs-instituts für vergleichende Religionsgeschichte an der Universität Leipzig, no. 4). 150 pp. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1922. — *Bornhäuser, K.*, Die Gebeine der Toten. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Anschauungen von der Totenauf resurrection zur Zeit des Neuen Testaments (BFchTh, xxvi, no. 3). 58 pp. 1921. — *Rudberg, G.*, Einige Platon-Parallelen zu neutestamentlichen Stellen (ThStKr, 1922, 179-186). — *Bröse, E.*, Paulus durch Virgil kommentiert. Zu Phil. 3, 12-14 (ThStKr, 1921, 78-81).

a

The new edition, much enlarged and brought down to 1924, of *Clemen's* indispensable handbook of the 'religionsgeschichtliche Erklärung' of the New Testament covers the most recent researches on Hermetic mysticism and Mandaeism. The criteria for inferring foreign influence are more sharply defined than before, and in some important points the author is now more inclined than hitherto to admit it; so with regard to the Son of Man, the Son of God, and the Kyrios, to the resurrection on the third day, and to the dove at the baptism. In particular he now sets a higher value on the influence of the mystery-religions. Unfortunately most of the English and American literature since 1914 was not available for the work.

b

Wetter's excellent popular presentation of the theme, Christianity and Hellenism, discusses especially christology and the idea of salvation. — *Thune Jacobsen*, in his thoughtful and original book, The Ancient World and Christianity, depicts the successive phases of religious individualism in Israel and in Judaism and its culmination in Jesus. From the gospel, the Hellenic spirit, after it had lost its inner vital harmony, gained a new source of inexhaustible power. The analysis of the inner nature of Jesus is of rare fineness and depth. (Fr.)

c

Reitzenstein's book on the Iranian mystery of redemption continues the researches reviewed in HThR, 1922, 210 ff. He discusses the recently discovered Manichaean fragments, especially a new Zarathustra fragment in which Zarathustra appears as redeemer and preacher of resurrection, as well as the Mandaean Book of the Dead and its relations to Christian-Gnostic literature, including the Odes of Solomon; and follows with historical observations and conclusions. He shows afresh that the hellenistic doctrine of the soul, the speculation as to the first man, the bar-nasha idea, the idea of awakening from the sleep of death, all are part of the Iranian-Mandaean-Manichaean movement. In an appendix he explains the doctrine of the Aeon and of the eternal city in the Orient and in Hellenism.¹⁰⁸

In ZNTW, 1921, *Reitzenstein* gives a short survey of the historical connection of the Iranian belief in a redeemer with Gnostic and Christian ideas such as the emancipation of the divine nature from matter, the identification of the first man with the soul, Jerusalem the eternal city, the Son of Man. — His article in the *Historische Zeitschrift* continues these researches. Poimandres is no longer the foundation of the groups of ideas which he is investigating. It is rather in an ancient oriental religion, with its ultimate source in India, that the basis of these beliefs as to the soul and a redeemer is to be sought. But many of the constitutive elements in the late Iranian religion are present in the Gathas. The vitalizing influence of India upon the Iranian system must have taken place before the time of Mani. In the Iranian religion two forms of the belief in redemption exist peaceably side by side — the redemption of all souls and the redemption of the individual at death. The Iranian idea of a descent and re-ascent of the redeemer came through Judaism into Christianity. *Reitzenstein*,

¹⁰⁸ See N. H. Schaeder, DLZ, 1922, no. 16; Geldner, ThLZ, 1922, no. 6, who, as an Indic scholar, rejects the Iranian origin of the Zarathustra fragment, the mystery of redemption, and the idea of the sleep of death; Ebeling, LZBl, 1922, no. 18, who looks for the ultimate source in Babylon on the ground of certain unpublished texts; and Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 238 ff.

as his theory requires, opposes the notion of Christian influence on the Mandaeans. In Jesus the idea of redemption received an ethical quality, and was individualized, so that a new religion was created; but without the influence of Iran upon later Judaism, the new religion could not have taken form, and further could not have gained adherents. To the figures which influenced primitive Christianity — the Jewish Messiah and the Persian universal Judge — a third is probably to be added, the Iranian messenger of God, the Son of Man who ascended to heaven.

Gressmann begins with a summary of *Reitzenstein's* ideas and goes on to discuss the Manichaeism and Mandaean religions and the apocalyptic religion of Judaism. He considers the songs of redemption as remains of the Manichaean hymnbook. The ancient apocalypse which *Reitzenstein* extracts from the 'Book of the Lord of Greatness', does not seem to *Gressmann* capable of exerting an influence on Q, and the priority of the Mandaean texts over the Odes of Solomon he also rejects. According to him the religion of redemption is of Iranian-Chaldaean origin. An important intermediate stage is the religion of Mithras, the intrinsic importance of which, as well as its influence on Judaism and Christianity, is to be rated more highly than has been customary of late. With Mithras is somehow to be connected the myth of the original man and the whole scene portrayed in Dan. 7 and 4 Ezra 13, as well as the worship which Antiochus Epiphanes tried to set up at Jerusalem.

Scheftelowitz drastically criticises *Reitzenstein's* theories. He holds Babylon to be the birthplace of Manichaeism, and points out several Babylonian elements. In the Jewish (talmudic) parallels which he adduces to various Manichaean and Mandaean ideas, he argues for Judaism as the source, and in Manichaeism he finds traces of Christian influence. The connection of the speculation about an original man with Iran is to be rejected. The myth of the messenger who descends to earth is Mandaean, not Iranian. In the 'Zarathustra hymn' everything but the name Zarathustra is Mandaean. Accordingly he too repudiates an Iranian mystery of redemption and refers the

Manichaeism to the Mandaeans. — Dibelius (ThLZ, 1923, 414 ff.) maintains, in reply to Scheftelowitz, that certain ideas, such as demonology and the belief in the heavenly counterparts of human beings, are derived from popular notions of Old Iran, and that in many cases to refer ideas to Mandaeism is only to postpone the issue. — In a vigorous polemic (GGA, 1923, 37–58) Reitzenstein defends his views against Scheftelowitz, casting doubts on the derivation of Manichaeism from Mandaeism and on the priority of the Jewish ideas claimed by his opponent. He goes on to defend his conception of what is Iranian and his theory of an Iranian origin for the mystery of redemption.

d

E. Norden's book on *The Birth of the Child* takes a long step forward in the understanding of the birth-legends of various religions. It is an interpretation of the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil in the light of comparative mythology, and discusses the myths of the birth of the child of the sun, who brings in and rules the new era. With these he connects the New Testament tradition, especially the gospel stories of the birth of Christ. The ideas of the conception from the Holy Ghost and the birth from the Virgin are derived from Graeco-Egyptian theology, as Norden explains, carrying further Leisegang's researches (see below, p. 113). He gives an interpretation of the entire pericope of the Annunciation, with many striking remarks (as that on ἐπισκιάζειν; and the suggestion that the episode was originally represented as told by Elizabeth), although these are not always convincing. The stories of the baptism and of the transfiguration also are put in a new light as scenes in an ancient drama of God the King, to which there are significant parallels, especially as regards the motive of the Beloved Son. In the same way he finds important references to Rev. 12.¹⁰⁹

Leipoldt gives an exhaustive and trustworthy account of the cults of dying and reviving gods (in Babylonia, Egypt, Phoenicia, Phrygia, and Greece), examines their elements (pure nature-worship and mysticism of the hereafter and of this

¹⁰⁹ See Bultmann, ThLZ, 1924, no. 15, 319–323; and F. Boll, DLZ, 1924, no. 10.

world), and adds a comparison with Jesus and primitive Christianity. He pays special attention to the Egyptian traditions, which include a baptism that not only cleanses but gives new life, and a baptism for the dead. The mysticism of the hereafter belongs particularly to the Osiris-cult,¹¹⁰ that of this life (that is, bringing salvation in this life), to the cult of Attis and Dionysus. A similar type of mysticism is found in Christianity only on gentile-christian soil; the inference that we rise from the dead because Jesus rose, is not found in the Synoptic Gospels. The story of the passion and resurrection, taken as a whole, he thinks has nothing in common with the myth of the dying and reviving god. When and through whom (was it Paul?) both forms of syncretistic mysticism were taken over, cannot be certainly known.¹¹¹

Leisegang continues the investigations into the pre-christian conceptions and doctrines of the pneuma and of mystical and intuitional knowledge which he began in his book, "Der heilige Geist" (Leipzig, 1919), discussing now those few passages in which the pneuma plays a part, with the aim of showing that they are derived from Graeco-hellenistic mysticism. The most important chapter is that which deals with birth from the pneuma. Although he has not proved his main thesis, yet his discussion of "inspiration through fecundation," of the birth of Dionysus, and of the mystical ideas of Philo, are of great interest. His parallels to the story of the baptism are not very significant; but his reference of *καὶ πυρὶ*, Matt. 3, 11, to the fire of enthusiasm is worth noting. The words about blasphemy against the Spirit he takes as a combination of two expressions, one relating to blasphemy against the name, the other against the Spirit; in Matt. 12, 28, Q must have read *ἐν ὀνόματι* (not *ἐν πνεύματι*) *θεοῦ*.¹¹² On the first beatitude, he recalls the resemblance of the beatitudes in Luke to the Cynic-Stoic diatribe. A defect in this valuable book is the neglect of the Old

¹¹⁰ Compare also H. Gressmann, *Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris nach Festbräuchen und Umzügen* (Der alte Orient 23, 3). Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1923.

¹¹¹ See K. L. Schmidt, *ThBl*, 1924, no. 4.

¹¹² In this connection, see A. Fridrichsen, 'Le Péché contre le Saint-Esprit,' *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses*, iii, 1923, 367-372.

Testament and Jewish background of New Testament ideas.¹¹³

Bornhäuser thinks that the Talmud casts a wholly new light on the New Testament idea of resurrection. His main point is as follows. The usual Pharisaic doctrine (not held strictly in the case of martyrs) is that if a man is buried, his bones are preserved, which insures his resurrection, but if his body is destroyed, burned, or eaten, no resurrection can take place. Jesus makes resurrection entirely independent of the preservation of the bones, but Paul takes the customary view. 1 Cor. 15, 50 means, "Only the bones have resurrection." In 2 Cor. 5, 1 ff. the 'tabernacle' refers to the skeleton. Laible (ThLBl, 1922, no. 21) points out that this distinction between the flesh and the bones as found in the Talmud is absurd; to transfer it to the New Testament is decidedly questionable.

The parallels in Plato which *Rudberg* notes are as follows: For 2 Cor. 3, 1 f. he cites Phaedrus, p. 276A, with which compare also 2 John 12; for Mk. 9, 43 ff., Symposium, p. 205E; for Matt. 10, 37 f., Phaedrus, p. 252A; for James 3, 9 ff., Laws ii, p. 659A; for 1 Cor. 6, 1 ff., Republic iii, p. 405; for Matt. 5, 3, Epistle 7, p. 335A; for Matt. 11, 29 f., Epistle 8, p. 354E.

From Virgil, Georgics iii. 103-112, *Bröse* would show that in Phil. 3, 12-14 Paul is thinking not of a foot-race but of a chariot-race; 'leaning forward as in a chariot-race, press toward the goal.'

¹¹³ See DLZ, 1922, no. 41; Bultmann, ThLZ, 1922, no. 20 (on the whole unfavorable); Deissner, ThGg, 1922, 231 ff.